



United States  
of America

# Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 113<sup>th</sup> CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 160

WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, JANUARY 16, 2014

No. 10

## House of Representatives

The House met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. YODER).

### DESIGNATION OF THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,  
January 16, 2014.

I hereby appoint the Honorable KEVIN YODER to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

JOHN A. BOEHNER,  
*Speaker of the House of Representatives.*

### PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Patrick J. Conroy, offered the following prayer:  
Dear God, we give You thanks for giving us another day.

We ask Your special blessing upon the Members of this people's House. They have faced difficult decisions in difficult times, but have labored hard to forge a significant compromise. As has been the testimony of history, difficult losses have been felt while possibilities for a more positive future have been created.

Bless our Nation, O God, that this legislation, as difficult as it has been to work out, will prove to be beneficial for us, and that our fellow citizens might know that all of us are responsible for creating a stronger community as a Nation.

Bless all who have labored so hard in these past days and weeks and be with them and with us all this day and every day to come.

May all that is done be for Your greater honor and glory.

Amen.

### THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has examined the Journal of the

last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

### PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentleman from Washington (Mr. KILMER) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. KILMER led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

### ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will entertain up to five requests for 1-minute speeches on each side of the aisle.

### CLEAN WATER IS A PRIORITY

(Mrs. CAPITO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. CAPITO. Mr. Speaker, for a week now, residents across the Kanawha Valley have been told not to use their tap water for any purpose. Businesses and schools have been closed for over a week. While things are returning to normal for some residents, tens of thousands of residents of West Virginia remain under a do-not-use water order due to a chemical leak from Freedom Industries into the Elk River which is upstream from the public water system, our water system.

For more than two decades, no government agency inspected this facility. Precious response time was lost because Freedom Industries did not immediately report the spill, and responders did not have sufficient information about the chemical.

We must examine our existing laws at all levels of government—local, State, and Federal—and find the gaps that allowed this spill to occur.

At my request, the House Transportation and Infrastructure Committee will hold a hearing in Charleston to examine the causes of the spill, the response, and the actions that should be taken.

I want to thank the West Virginia National Guard, the West Virginia Department of Homeland Security, FEMA, first responders, and many, many West Virginians and volunteers across the State, along with our neighbors from neighboring States. But West Virginians were just amazing. We joined together to meet this challenge and have exemplified once again that Mountaineer spirit which we are very well known for.

### CLIMATE CHANGE

(Mr. McNERNEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. McNERNEY. Mr. Speaker, the evidence for climate change is overwhelming, be it superstorms, megadroughts, migration of biological systems, the disappearance of historic glaciers, ocean acidification, or the melting of the polar ice cap. The potential for catastrophic change grows every year.

Unfortunately, House Republicans continue to push legislation that exacerbates climate change. Last year, Republicans reduced funding for the clean energy technologies, interfered with R&D at the Department of Energy, and prevented the EPA from addressing carbon emissions.

Our economy is expected to grow this year; and with that growth, carbon emissions will rise. The United States is a leader in technology and innovation. We should use this leadership as

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

H1217

an opportunity to foster cooperation between public and private interests, to work together to provide low-cost, clean energy. Instead, it has been used by the House Republicans to bludgeon the EPA and to roll back the environmental gains of the past half century.

#### SUPPORTING COMPUTER SCIENCE EDUCATION

(Mr. KILMER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. KILMER. Mr. Speaker, last week Hadi Partovi, co-founder of Code.org, testified in the Science Committee that by 2020 there will be 100,000 more computer science jobs in America than American students to fill them, and that women and minorities are underrepresented in these growing fields.

I have got 24,002 reasons to care about this: there are 24,000 open computing jobs in my State right now, and I have two little girls who will be entering into a workforce that will rely on skills in computing.

Right now, only 17 States accept computer science as a core math or science credit. That is why I support the Computer Science Education Act to fix this. According to an article in Education Week, in this last year in 11 States, not a single African American student took the AP computer science course; not a single Latino student in eight States, not a single female student in two States.

If we are going to compete and ensure all students can make it in America, we have got to close the participation gap and provide these opportunities in every State. We have got to step it up.

#### COMMEMORATING RICHMOND HEIGHTS' 65TH ANNIVERSARY

(Mr. GARCIA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. GARCIA. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to commemorate the 65th anniversary of Richmond Heights, a community that from its very beginning fostered inclusion and respect.

I recently had the opportunity to read a great book, "Miami's Richmond Heights," which was written by Patricia Harper Garrett and her daughter, Jessica Garrett Modkins, good friends of mine. It chronicles the story of a community that was set up by Captain Frank Martin, a White Pan Am pilot, who bought the land in 1949, knowing that a lot of World War II veterans, African American World War II veterans, would be returning armed with the GI Bill, but unable to purchase homes. He created this community based on racial equality and inclusion. It is one of the great communities of my district.

The African American leadership that it inspired—folks like Canon Theodore Gibson, Reverend John A. Ferguson, who created the Second Baptist Church, and Senator Larcenia

Bullard—that leadership has been passed on to others in Richmond Heights where today we have Senator Dwight Bullard and Reverend Alphonso Jackson.

Mr. Speaker, it is with great pride that I commemorate the 65th anniversary of Richmond Heights and Patricia Garrett's terrific book.

#### UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE

(Mr. BARBER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. BARBER. Mr. Speaker, on December 28, 1.3 million Americans lost their unemployment insurance because Congress failed to act. These families are struggling to put food on the table, to pay their bills, to heat their homes; and we have a responsibility to assist them in their time of need and as they continue to look for work.

But instead, Congress will go home today without taking action, and this is just outrageous. Every week that Congress ignores its responsibilities to our citizens, 72,000 more Americans lose their unemployment insurance, crucial assistance which not only supports them, but also our economy.

That is why I call on leadership to keep the House in session and to extend unemployment insurance now. We should stay here and do our job, for we are representing the people of America and those who we have a duty to serve. Let us stay here and make sure that Americans know that we have their back, that we are going to take care of them in their desperate time of need. I urge the House to stay in session and pass an extension to the unemployment insurance program.

#### EXTEND UNEMPLOYMENT BENEFITS

(Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I have learned a lot in my first year in Congress, but I could serve here a lifetime and never understand how some Members could be so callous and so shortsighted that they are ready to cut off a lifeline for millions of Americans, including 137,000 New Yorkers.

These New Yorkers are hardworking people, like Stephen from Sugar Loaf, who wrote to me because he needs unemployment insurance to stay in his house; like Brenda in Fishkill, where she and her husband are both enrolled in retraining courses right now trying to get work and need this insurance just to make ends meet; like Johnine in Warwick, who lost her job to outsourcing, but still has to take care of her daughter; like Carol in Dutchess County, who may not be able to take care of her disabled husband without this assistance; like Ingrid from Highland Falls, who fought for her country in war and now has to worry about putting food on the table for her children.

We must renew unemployment insurance for people like these now because every week that goes by, there are 5,000 more people like Stephen and Brenda and Johnine and Carol and Ingrid. These aren't statistics. They are hard-working Americans, and they need this Congress to act, and act now.

#### HONORING CAPTAIN CHRISTOPHER STOVER

(Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER asked and was given permission to address the House.)

Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to honor Captain Christopher Stover of Vancouver who was tragically killed last week in a military training accident near Salthouse, England. A 4.0 student at Evergreen High School, Captain Stover chose to serve his country and attend the United States Air Force Academy.

Captain Stover was a pilot of the HH-60G Pave Hawk helicopter and served tours in both Iraq and Afghanistan. According to his family and friends, Chris had a passion for flying and he loved his job. A high school teacher said he was caring and nurturing and was known for fostering a strong sense of community. Not long ago, he visited an elementary school in Vancouver to thank a group of children who had sent him cards while he was overseas, and to tell them about his passion for flying.

He is survived by his wife, Sarah, and his parents, Maribel and Richard. Our thoughts and prayers are with you. We can never replace what you have lost, but on behalf of a grateful Nation, we thank you; and we will always remember his service.

There is an Air Force Academy tradition for those graduates who pass away. It comes from the third verse of the Air Force song. I will carry on that tradition by saying:

Captain Stover, here's a toast.

#### EXCHANGE INFORMATION DISCLOSURE ACT

##### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on H.R. 3362.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 455, I call up the bill (H.R. 3362) to amend the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act to require transparency in the operation of American Health Benefit Exchanges, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 455, the amendment printed in part B of House

Report 113-322 is adopted. The bill, as amended, is considered read.

The text of the bill, as amended, is as follows:

H.R. 3362

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

# SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Exchange Information Disclosure Act”.

# SEC. 2. WEEKLY REPORTS ON HEALTH BENEFIT EXCHANGES.

Section 1311(c)(5) of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (42 U.S.C. 18031(c)(5)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (A), by striking “and” at the end;

(2) in subparagraph (B), by striking the period and inserting a semicolon; and

(3) by inserting after subparagraph (B) the following:

“(C) not later than the first Monday after the date of enactment of this subparagraph, and each Monday thereafter through March 30, 2015 (or the next business day when Monday occurs on a Federal holiday), in coordination with the Secretary of the Treasury and the Secretary of Labor, submit to Congress and make available to State governors, State insurance commissioners, and the public, a report concerning consumer interactions with the Internet website maintained by the Federal Government for health insurance coverage (healthcare.gov or any subsequent Internet site (or sites) that is established in whole or in part by the Federal Government to facilitate enrollment in qualified health plans, the receipt of advance premium tax credits or cost sharing reduction assistance, or comparisons of available qualified health plans) and any efforts undertaken to remedy problems that impact taxpayers and consumers, such report to include—

“(i) a State-by-State break down of—

“(I) the number of unique website visits;

“(II) the number of web chat logins;

“(III) the number of individuals who create an account;

“(IV) the number of individuals who have selected a qualified health plan;

“(V) the number of individuals who enrolled in Medicaid, and, of such number, the number who became eligible to enroll because of changes in eligibility effected under this Act and the number who otherwise were eligible to enroll;

“(VI) the number of individuals who have effectuated enrollment in a qualified health plan through payment of the first monthly premium;

“(VII) the age of individuals who have effectuated enrollment in a qualified health plan through payment of the first monthly premium;

“(VIII) the number of enrollees in each zip code; and

“(IX) the level of coverage obtained;

“(ii) a detailed description of the problems identified with website functionality, the actions that have been taken to resolve those problems, the identity of the contractors that are involved in such actions, the cost of such actions, how such actions are being paid for, and the names of the Federal officials responsible for overseeing the process; and

“(iii) a description of the separate problems with the website, including problems relating to—

“(I) logging into the website;

“(II) enrolling in coverage;

“(III) transferring to the State Medicaid programs;

“(IV) the calculation of advance premium tax credits or cost sharing reductions;

“(V) eligibility for qualified health plans, advance premium tax credits, cost sharing reductions, Medicaid, or the Children’s Health Insurance Program;

“(VI) income or identity verification;

“(VII) the transfer of information to health insurance issuers; and

“(VIII) consumer privacy and data security; and

“(D) not later than the first Monday after the date of enactment of this subparagraph, and each Monday thereafter through March 30, 2015 (or the next business day when Monday occurs on a Federal holiday), in coordination with the Secretary of the Treasury and the Secretary of Labor, submit to Congress and make available to State governors, State insurance commissioners, and the public, a report concerning the Federally operated customer service call center, including the number of calls received by the call center, the Internet website or enrollment problems identified by users, how many calls are referred to the Centers for Consumer Information and Insurance Oversight, how many calls are referred to State insurance commissioners, and how many callers enrolled in a qualified health plan through the call center.”.

# SEC. 3. DISCLOSURE OF NAVIGATOR AND CERTIFIED APPLICATION COUNSELOR GRANTEES.

Section 1311(i) of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (42 U.S.C. 18031(i)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(7) PUBLIC AVAILABILITY OF LIST OF NAVIGATORS.—Not later than 5 days after the date of enactment of the Exchange Information Disclosure Act, the Secretary shall make available to Congress, State attorneys general, State insurance commissioners, and the public a list of all navigators and certified application counselors that have been trained and certified by Exchanges, including contact information for all navigator entities and their partner organizations, including subcontractors. Such list shall be updated by the Secretary on a weekly basis through March 31, 2015.”.

# SEC. 4. DISCLOSURE OF CERTIFIED AGENTS AND BROKERS.

Section 1312(e) of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (42 U.S.C. 18032(e)) is amended by adding at the end the following flush sentence: “Not later than 5 days after the date of the enactment of the Exchange Information Disclosure Act, the Secretary shall make available on the Internet website maintained by the Federal Government for health insurance coverage (healthcare.gov or any subsequent Internet site (or sites) that is established in whole or in part by the Federal Government to facilitate enrollment in qualified health plans, the receipt of tax credits or cost sharing reduction assistance, or comparisons of available qualified health plans) a list of all agents and brokers who have been trained and certified by the Federal Exchange, including their name, business address (if available), and phone number. Such list shall be updated on a weekly basis through March 31, 2015.”.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The bill shall be debatable for 60 minutes, with 40 minutes equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Energy and Commerce and 20 minutes equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PITTS) and the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) each will control 20 minutes. The gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CAMP) and the gen-

tleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN) each will control 10 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 3362, the Exchange Information Disclosure Act. This bill is fundamentally about transparency. Since healthcare.gov’s disastrous launch, the public has received confusing and conflicting information about the site’s functionality and the number of individuals actually able to purchase insurance through the Web site.

□ 1015

States trying to enroll individuals in Medicaid and insurance companies trying to sign people up for private insurance have received incomplete and inaccurate applications from the Web site.

H.R. 3362 would require the Secretary of HHS to provide a State-by-State breakdown of the number of unique Web site visits, the number of individuals who create an account, the number of individuals who select a qualified health plan, and the number of individuals who enrolled in a qualified health plan or Medicaid. The report must also describe the problems Americans are encountering with the Web site and how HHS is addressing them.

The American people have a right to firm data and an accurate picture of the exchanges. I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I am afraid the bill before the House today, H.R. 3362, the Exchange Information Disclosure Act, is simply an effort by Republicans to continue to impede the efforts of the administration to implement the Affordable Care Act.

Transparency and enrollment information is important for Members of this body to receive. But this bill’s requirements on the Secretary go way above and beyond what I think is necessary and valuable information. This is just an attempt to pile so many requirements on the administration that they are taking away from the true job of enrolling people in the law.

Enrollment numbers and visitors to the site are important pieces of information, and we certainly all know that, but this bill is simply unnecessary. There is already extensive disclosure of data on health insurance enrollments being provided. The administration releases enrollment data monthly, just like they do with Medicare and the children’s health insurance program and other Federal programs. The monthly HHS enrollment reports are excellent, detailed reports. In fact, the newest HHS monthly enrollment report, which was issued this Monday, which covers enrollment through December, has even more extensive data than the two earlier monthly reports.

Mr. Speaker, in addition to providing data on total enrollments nationally

and in the States, the latest report includes data both for the Nation and the States on, first, greater breakdown of those who have selected marketplace plans; second, age breakdown—I stress, age breakdown—of those who have selected marketplace plans; third, financial assistance status of those who have selected marketplace plans; and, lastly, a breakdown of the coverage level—or metal level—of the plans people have selected.

So these numbers show that there is a very strong demand for the quality, affordable coverage options now available to Americans because of the Affordable Care Act. More than 6 million Americans have now either signed up for a private health insurance plan or for Medicaid, including the nearly 2.2 million who signed up for private insurance through the marketplace. Nearly 1.8 million of these consumers signed up for private plans in December, and that is nearly five times as many people as signed up in October and November combined.

Frankly, Mr. Speaker, I am encouraged and excited by these numbers. Americans aren't going to the Web site because they are forced to, like the Republicans claim. They are going to the Web site because they want and need access to health insurance. This should be no surprise. Thirty percent—nearly one in three—of people who have enrolled in a marketplace plan are younger than age 35; 24 percent are between 18 and 34 years old; and there was a more than eightfold increase in December enrollments in the Federal marketplace. In addition, more than 3 million young adults have gained coverage because the Affordable Care Act allows them to stay on their parents' plan until they turn 26. So we are getting more of the younger people as well.

Meanwhile, healthcare.gov and State Web sites have received more than 53 million visits, and State and Federal call centers have received more than 11 million calls.

The administration has committed to release this information monthly, the way they have done with every other Federal program to date. So I am sorry to say that I simply do not believe this is a serious effort in any sense of the word by Republicans. This bill is nothing but a weak effort to smear the law.

I urge Members to oppose the bill. There are only so many resources out there. Why would we want HHS to have to provide this excessive information? I would rather they spent their time trying to enroll people, doing more outreach, and encouraging people to sign up so that they actually have health insurance.

So again, Mr. Speaker, I urge Members to oppose this legislation, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, at this time, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. UPTON), the chairman of the Energy and Commerce Committee.

Mr. UPTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 3362, the Exchange Information Disclosure Act.

This bill would require that HHS provide weekly progress reports regarding the President's health care law and attempt to ensure greater transparency from an administration that has done everything that it can so far to bury the facts when it comes to its signature health care law. Remember, this is the administration that knew millions of Americans would receive cancellation notices, but they only acted to allow people to keep their health care plans that they had and liked after we forced their hand back a few months ago. Perhaps by acting today we can again force them to do the right thing and share basic information with policymakers and the public about how the law is working or not.

In building healthcare.gov for the October 1 start of open enrollment, the administration chose not to allow Americans to window-shop and find accurate and reliable prices of health care plans in the exchange.

Over the last 17 weeks since the law was launched, this administration has released enrollment figures on just a handful of occasions. We are still left asking the most important question: "Who's paid?"

Instead, the administration has gone to great lengths to redefine enrollment as the number of folks who have selected a plan through the exchanges. These numbers simply don't tell us the true status of the law, however. More than 3 months after the start of open enrollment, we still don't know how many Americans have actually enrolled in health plans by paying their first month's premium.

Just 1 day before the start of open enrollment, Secretary Sebelius defined success as enrolling 7 million Americans by the end of March of 2014. The administration has since distanced itself from enrollment being a measure of success at all. If enrolling individuals in health plans is not the goal, what is?

Preventing access to reliable data about the exchanges is not exactly what you would expect from the self-proclaimed "most transparent administration in history." It should not take a vote in Congress to get basic information from the administration, but without voluntary transparency, we don't have any other choice.

The bill before us would require HHS to provide accurate, useful figures about enrollment and the operation of the exchanges on a weekly basis. It also is going to require HHS to report to the American people other key metrics, including demographics of enrollees, Medicaid enrollment, regular reporting on ongoing problems with healthcare.gov, and HHS' efforts to address those issues.

The President's health care law will cost the taxpayers an estimated \$2 trillion over the next decade. At the very

least, the administration should provide the American people regular and ongoing information about its implementation. There is no reason for the administration to keep the public and the Congress in the dark. Whether the news is good or bad, it is time for full disclosure.

I urge my colleagues to support the bill, and I applaud Mr. TERRY for his leadership.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina, G.K. BUTTERFIELD, a member of the Energy and Commerce Committee.

Mr. BUTTERFIELD. Thank you, Mr. PALLONE, for yielding time, and especially thank you for your leadership on our committee. It has been nothing less than extraordinary.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong opposition to the Exchange Information Disclosure Act. This bill would cost millions of dollars of limited Federal resources but doesn't include any mechanism for paying for it. It is an unnecessary piece of legislation that will have no impact or benefit to the American people. It is just the latest attempt by the Republican majority to incite fear and distrust of the Federal health insurance marketplace and discredit President Obama and the Affordable Care Act.

Washington Post columnist Greg Sargent wrote that the Exchange Information Disclosure Act is "a political attack coming from a party that wants to see the law fail." The House has voted 47 times, Mr. Speaker, on bills that would repeal or undermine the Affordable Care Act, but not one of them has become law.

My friend Mr. TERRY's bill that we are considering today marks the 48th attempt, and it is another nail in the coffin of haphazard Republican efforts to disenfranchise the American people by chipping away at the Affordable Care Act, with the ultimate goal of taking away Americans' access to affordable health care.

Make no mistake, this bill is not about transparency and open government. Its true purpose is to pile on more and more unnecessary, cumbersome, and unprecedented requirements so that HHS will be forced to focus time and attention away from managing the Federal health insurance marketplace and redirect it to completing worthless weekly reports.

I am particularly disappointed in the committee process—or more accurately, the lack of committee process—with regard to this bill. I sit on Energy and Commerce's Health Subcommittee, and at no point did the chairman of the subcommittee nor the full committee hold a legislative hearing or markup on this bill. I don't recall one. Surely, adding mountains of onerous reporting requirements that will cost the government millions in order to comply would have warranted an opportunity for members to weigh in before it was brought to the floor. Apparently, the

chairman of the committee felt differently.

This bill is now the 48th example of House Republicans pandering to their base by ramming through partisan policies that attack the President. The bill would require HHS to supply Congress weekly reports detailing the number of unique Web site visitors to [healthcare.gov](http://healthcare.gov), the number of chat logins, the number of enrollees by ZIP Code, their level of coverage, and other data sets. What exactly my friends hope to accomplish with this weekly data dump still escapes me.

Perhaps House Republicans weren't aware of the extensive disclosure of data on health insurance enrollments that is already being provided on a monthly basis. The administration releases enrollment data monthly. Mr. Speaker, just like they do with Medicare, CHIP, and other Federal programs.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman an additional minute.

Mr. BUTTERFIELD. The monthly HHS enrollment reports are excellent, detailed reports. Weekly reports will shed no more light on enrollment in the health exchange than would monthly reports.

The bill also demands that HHS make publicly available a list of navigator grantees. Were my colleagues unaware that the Department released the entire list of navigator grantees back in October? I have those here for your inspection.

I will say it again: this bill is completely unnecessary, and it is Republican fear mongering. The fact is, Mr. Speaker, the Affordable Care Act is the law of the land. I ask my colleagues to embrace it. It is benefiting millions of Americans in my district and in your district as well.

Thank you for the time, Mr. PALLONE.

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, at this time, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. TERRY), the prime sponsor of the legislation.

Mr. TERRY. Mr. Speaker, to clarify one thing, we did have a legislative hearing on this bill with robust debate on it in that committee hearing. Evidently, you didn't get the notice of that hearing.

Mr. BUTTERFIELD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TERRY. No, I only have 3 minutes. If I have extra time, I will.

Today we are taking what should be an easy vote and, frankly, a bipartisan vote.

My legislation, the Exchange Information Disclosure Act, does nothing more than ask the administration to provide Congress, Governors, State insurance commissioners, and the American people with information.

By the way, the information that is outlined in this bill to be provided or accessible on a weekly basis is simply

what most States already require to be done by health insurance companies within their States. This is a request by State insurance commissioners, especially ours from Nebraska that are very frustrated with the lack of information that they are receiving about who is signing up for what plans in the State of Nebraska.

This should be easy. What we are talking about here today is basic transparency so we all have the data to assess what is working and what is not. This bill is a mechanism for accountability so we can get the answers that both Democrats and Republicans and State insurance commissioners and Governors need to know in order to understand what is working and what is not.

We are asking for information that an entity overseeing a health insurance operation should have at the tip of their fingers at all times.

□ 1030

Our metrics are not complex. We are simply asking for: How many people have enrolled? How many of these people have paid their first month's premiums, which means they are actually insured, that they have been effectuated? What plans did they pick? What ZIP Codes are they from so we know if people from Nebraska or Iowa or Kansas have signed up? Were they already eligible for Medicare or are these new enrollees from the expansion? These are critical issues in determining the safety and soundness of the policies being issued, and is, again, information that State insurance commissioners usually receive.

This administration and some on the other side say that this information that we are requesting is extraneous and costly and burdensome, but yet this data is already being obtained; it is already on a realtime basis being calculated. It is just the issue of when and in what form this is released to the public. As to cost, here is the CBO score—zero—not the millions that we are being told by our friends on the other side of the aisle and the White House. This is necessary, usual course of business data.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. PITTS. I yield the gentleman an additional 1 minute.

Mr. TERRY. We do add another part in here and another frustration from our State insurance commissioners, which is that they don't know who is selling the insurance. They would like to have the names of the people who are the navigators out there. Grants go to organizations, but we don't know who is actually sitting down and selling policies or helping them through the exchange. That is, again, basic information that is the normal course of business in the insurance world. We are just asking that they provide the same information that the State law would require of an insurance company that has had a salesman who is out signing people up.

So that is the totality of this bill, and you have to ask the question: If they are fighting so hard, what are they trying to hide?

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. WAXMAN), the ranking member of the Energy and Commerce Committee.

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Speaker and my colleagues, supporters of this legislation claim that it is simply an effort to get more information about how the Affordable Care Act is being implemented, but it is not really that. It is an effort to slow down the implementation of the new law by drowning the Department of Health and Human Services in red tape.

They want enrollment information, but this week, they got enrollment information from the administration. That enrollment information showed that 2.2 million Americans have signed up for private coverage. They want demographic information. HHS has given them demographic information. HHS is going to release all of the information that they are asking for every month, but the Republicans say, "Oh, that is not good enough. We want it every week." They want more than what otherwise might be available to them because they want to know some things that I can't understand why they would want to know them.

They want to know the ZIP Codes of everybody who has signed up. They want to know what the details are of a chat between somebody who is asking a question on the Web site and what answers he got. I can't understand why that is important. They want to know what transpired in the call centers. In other words, they want to know what somebody said in a call center. Is it their business to know what questions are asked in a call center? They want a list of the people who are the adjusters and the brokers. There are thousands of them around the country, so there is no purpose to knowing that. They are not accredited by the government. If they are by the States, it is up to each State. They could ask each State that information.

Let me put this in perspective.

If anybody had a bill asking the private sector to come up with reports every single week on information that they could wait a couple of more weeks to get, it would be looked at as just straight harassment, government red tape, bureaucracy that is intruding into the business for no purpose. That is what this bill is all about. They want to intrude in a government agency. I guess, if they have a bureaucratic intrusion and the harassment of a government agency, it is okay, but if it were to happen to a private sector business, it would be inappropriate. If we asked polluters this information, you could get the information. If you asked them to give you the information every week, why do you need it every week?

I ask the Republicans: Why do they need this every week if they are going to get it every month?

It is obvious. This law is working, and they don't want to come again to the floor and ask for its repeal because people have insurance. Millions of people now have insurance. If they want to repeal the law, they are going to take that insurance away from them.

They want to continue to say: What are they hiding? What are they hiding that they are not giving you on a weekly schedule but that they are giving you on a monthly schedule?

Absolutely nothing that is significant. The enrollment reports we already have indicate that over 6 million people have signed up for coverage since October 1. The Web site can handle 80,000 simultaneous users, and it has been stable even though there was a surge of enrollment in late December.

The law is working. Republicans don't want to hear these facts. They don't want to know about it, but they think they should get everybody at HHS—maybe even have them hire more people—to report to them every week so they can still not recognize that there is good news in what is actually happening.

This is a goofy bill—it is absolutely unnecessary—and I urge my colleagues to vote against it.

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, just to clarify, we hear the words “sign up,” “signed up,” “equal to enrollment.” We may know how many people have signed up. We do not know how many have actually enrolled and have paid their first month's premiums. Secondly, we are stewards of the taxpayers—we are not shareholders—and the lack of data is precisely what led the chairman of the Senate Finance Committee to declare this law as a train wreck in that there are no metrics, no data, to determine whether this law is working and on track.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. SARBANES), a member of the Energy and Commerce Committee.

Mr. SARBANES. I thank the chairman of the Health Subcommittee.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to urge a “no” vote on H.R. 3362, which, I think, is really just designed to harass the Department of Health and Human Services as it is trying to do its job in bringing affordable health care to people all across this country.

If you look at the metrics that are already being assembled by the agency on a monthly basis, they really present a very clear picture of whether there is progress being made or not being made with respect to the Web site and signing people up for affordable health care, and of course, we know that there is a lot of progress being made. That monthly report includes the total enrollments nationally and by State so that we can get a clear picture of what that trend is, and that is a positive trend. It includes a gender breakdown of those who have signed up for the

plans, an age breakdown, the financial assistance, and what kinds of plans people are choosing. That is all good, useful information. Frankly, it is the kind of information that it makes sense to collect on a monthly basis, not on a weekly basis. I mean, these numbers sort of naturally evolve month to month. That is the picture, the photograph, you want to take—month to month. Week to week doesn't really get you any added insight into what is happening with the Web site or with the signups.

Then look at some of the information that they would require on a weekly basis, and you have got to ask yourself: What purpose would it serve, a State-by-State breakdown—I am reading from the bill now—of the number of Web chat logins? What are we going to do with that information? That is not useful. That does not add anything to the clear picture that can emerge on a monthly basis of how we are doing with the Web site.

Finally, I have to observe, as Ranking Member WAXMAN just did a moment ago, that we hear all the time from our friends on the other side about the importance of government efficiency and about working well and streamlining. We hear them talk about that both with respect to government and, obviously, in terms of what they want to do for private sector businesses out there. These kinds of requirements don't help with that. They are not going to make the agency function more smoothly and more efficiently and get the information out in a sensible way to the American people.

This is really just designed to kind of harass the agency, to make them run around in small circles, gathering information and providing stuff that doesn't give us any added perspective or insight into the progress that really is now being made. We can get that picture on a monthly basis. The information that HHS is providing to us and to the public—to the American people—I think, is very valuable on that monthly basis, and that is the way we ought to continue to have it presented to us and presented to the American people.

So I urge my colleagues to vote against H.R. 3362. Let's let the agency do its job and do it well.

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, opponents of the Exchange Information Disclosure Act have argued that requiring weekly reports on the health care law to the American people is too burdensome, too costly for the Department of Health and Human Services. Yet, somehow, HHS managed to find money in its budget for taxpayer-funded grants spent on such things as bike lane signs, dog neutering campaigns, promoting a sport called “pickleball,” and lobbying campaigns for soda taxes. Clearly, HHS does not suffer from a lack of resources.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, may I just ask how much time remains.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New Jersey has 5 minutes

remaining. The gentleman from Pennsylvania has 10 minutes remaining.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to my colleague from New Jersey (Mr. ANDREWS), who has spent so much effort in passing and drafting the Affordable Care Act.

(Mr. ANDREWS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ANDREWS. I thank my friend from New Jersey for his tireless leadership on this very important cause. It is inspirational.

Mr. Speaker, since the Affordable Care Act became law, 9 million Americans have health insurance who did not have it before—9 million people. Now, not surprisingly, there have been problems in the implementation of the law. Many customer service problems need to be addressed, and we should come together in good faith and make sure they get addressed. This bill takes us in the opposite direction. It says that people who could be working on solving the very real and important problems of customers who are trying to enroll in health insurance will have to write a report once a week instead of once a month.

If you go to get your car fixed and if there is a long line of people ahead of you and if you are going to be late to get back to work and if you find out the reason the line takes so long is that the person at the counter explains the history of the carburetor to every person who comes to pick up his car instead of waiting on the people who are in line, requiring a report a week instead of a report a month just doesn't make any sense.

There is another reason to oppose this bill, though, that is even more important than that. Today, 10,000 Americans will go home and tell their children or their loved ones that they have run out of income because their unemployment benefits have expired. This week, 72,000 Americans will have that happen to them. There is a bill in this House, on this floor, that could be taken up this morning and voted on to provide relief to our neighbors and family members who are in that position. This majority leadership has ignored that legislation.

This is a breathtaking misplacement of priorities. We can spend an hour of the House's time on harassing Health and Human Services into filing one report every week instead of one report every month, but we can't take 5 minutes and debate on a bill that will restore a measure of decency and income to 72,000 Americans a week. Many of these Americans are over 50 years old. For every one job that is advertised there are three people looking for that job. The callous indifference of the House majority leadership to these people is just wrong—and so is this bill.

We should reject this bill and, instead, proceed with a vote on aid to America's long-term unemployed.

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, at this time, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes



to the gentlelady from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN), the vice chairman of the Energy and Commerce Committee.

□ 1045

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania for the great work that he has done on this bill.

What is so interesting and one of the reasons we find it necessary to come and address these issues is Secretary Sebelius told us in December that 5,000 people a day were getting access to health care that they had not had before.

The other side of that story, which was not told, is 74,000 American families a day were getting cancellation notices. They were looking at one another across the dinner table and saying, Guess what, our insurance has been canceled.

It has had a devastating effect. And as we try to do oversight and due diligence and continue to push for that oversight and due diligence and carry it out, even this morning at the Energy and Commerce Committee, where we had Mr. COHEN, what we have found is it is very difficult to get information, even when we are sometimes hearing from employees admitting what they told us was wrong; but then we do not get the straight story.

So it is very appropriate that we require HHS to release weekly detailed reports about the exchanges, including their enrollment, their functionality, and efforts to address the technical issues at [healthcare.gov](http://healthcare.gov).

It is absolutely appropriate because this is all being done with the taxpayers' money. The American taxpayers have paid for every bit of this. It is not the Federal Government's money. It is not President Obama's money. It is not Congress' money. It is the taxpayers' money. This is a failed rollout and a failed program.

This administration was supposed to be the most transparent administration in history. It has not been that. It is well documented that it hasn't been. Indeed, the rollout and the implementation of this law have been even less transparent. The reason, I think, is because there have been so many problems, such as millions of Americans losing access to their health insurance.

None of the information being shared by the administration regarding enrollment means much of anything. We talk about people that enrolled, but we don't know how many people have paid and how many people have completed that process. What are the demographics of the individuals that are enrolling?

All of this is information that the individual that is paying for this—the American taxpayer—deserves to know.

Who has paid for this insurance? The White House has backed away from using any measure of enrollment as a means to determine success.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. PITTS. I yield the gentlewoman an additional 1 minute.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. As recently as September, Secretary Sebelius herself said that 7 million enrolled by the end of March would define success of the law. Well, is that 7 million that go to the Web site, put an insurance product in their cart, and then go think about it?

Mr. Speaker, when I was growing up, I spent a lot of time working in the retail industry selling clothes in a little dress shop. Every once in a while we would have somebody that would come in and put something on hold. They would say, I'm going to be back.

Well, we called them the "be-backs" because, guess what, more often than not, they did not come back and complete that purchase. Yes, they put it on hold. Yes, they put it in an online shopping cart. But then they move away from it because this program is broken, it is too expensive to afford, and the American people do not want it.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, at this time I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana, Dr. CASSIDY, a very active member of the Health Subcommittee.

Mr. CASSIDY. Mr. Speaker, I kind of keep asking myself why we would not want to provide transparency.

If the Federal Government is going to impose a massive bureaucratic regime involving the American people, why should we not at least require them to be accountable for the success or failure of that regime?

The Exchange Information Disclosure Act requires accountability and transparency, which has been, frankly, elusive from the administration on these issues. And, indeed, before committees and before Americans there has been a tendency to give information which is misleading.

For example, enrollment numbers are calculated by the numbers who sign up for coverage, not those who actually pay for their first month's premium. In reality, unless you pay for that first month's premium, you are not enrolled. Coverage does not become effective until these are paid; and history shows many will sign up who will never actually enroll.

The American people are affected by this. They are paying for it. We are their employees, so to speak. They pay our salary. They have a right to know, and the only way to know is to see the results.

I keep on smiling in kind of an angry sort of way when I think about those folks who came to testify about the Web site.

Two weeks before it was to open, we were told that it was ready and that there were no problems. I specifically asked if the Spanish-language Web site was ready. Oh, yes, there's no problem. We can just stand it up.

In truth, none of that was true. The only way we learned it was not true

was when the numbers came out, it was clear that folks were not enrolling. So everything we had been told was exposed as a lie, and yet we would not have known had we not seen those enrollment figures.

Compliance should not be difficult. Insurance companies know on a daily basis how many people have clicked on, how many people have signed up, how many checks they receive. Insurance companies know this on a daily basis. Certainly, Mr. Speaker, the Federal Government can tell the American people these results on a weekly basis.

The Exchange Information Disclosure Act is a commonsense piece of legislation that all my colleagues who champion transparency and accountability should support. All it does is ensure full disclosure of the most important data points needed to determine what is really going on with the President's health care law's implementation.

It is vitally important for the public, and it is vitally important for us as we attempt to do the American people's will in our oversight of the program.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. ELLISON).

Mr. ELLISON. Mr. Speaker, we are told that the Exchange Information Disclosure Act is just a good-faith effort to try to get some transparency. But wait, isn't this bill coming from the same party that shut the government down to try to kill it? Didn't that just happen?

My memory is not faint about it. My memory is very clear that we stood here watching the Republican majority shut down all of government to prevent people from health care access.

And now we are supposed to believe, Oh, we just want to make the bill a little better with transparency. No. What has happened is that millions of people are signing up. People know that if you snatch a benefit from people that they have—and expect to have—that is going to cause issues. And so now the tactics have changed. Instead of an overt 50th repeal bill, now we will just try to undermine it by making a bunch of paper requirements—more distraction, more paperwork, more division, more obstruction.

I think I prefer the days when we just had repeal bills.

Vote "no" on this bill.

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, I am prepared to close, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, again, this GOP bill is designed to harass the Department, preventing it from doing its job. It is an unworkable, unnecessary bill that places onerous, unrealistic, and costly reporting requirements on HHS, with no benefit to the general public.

I heard my colleagues say over and over again, Oh, nobody is going to enroll. Now people are enrolling, and they say they want to know whether they paid or not.

Where does it end? Why don't you spend your time trying to get people to enroll, trying to give people information and do more outreach so people actually are able to get health insurance? That is what we are trying to do with the Affordable Care Act—make people who don't have insurance get insurance, make people who do have it, have it more affordable and have a better benefit package.

All these things are wonderful. This is what people want. That is why so many people are, in fact, signing up. And I just cannot help but think that this is nothing but another effort to make it more burdensome, to scare people to make it less likely that people actually enroll.

Mr. Speaker, I wanted to mention that the administration opposed the bill. The administration said that they oppose the passage because it would require unfunded, unprecedented, and unnecessary reporting requirements that exceed those of other public and private programs.

I urge a “no” vote, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, as Secretary Sebelius acknowledged at an Energy and Commerce hearing in December, enrollment in an exchange plan is not complete until the first month's premium has been paid.

The administration, so far, has refused to tell the American people how many people are actually enrolled by paying their first month's premium in the health care law's exchanges.

Asking the Department to provide the American people regular updates is simply a matter of transparency. Given that HHS officials were so blatantly wrong about the readiness of the health care law's exchanges, they don't deserve the benefit of the doubt.

Regular disclosure is necessary to assess the status of the law, and that is all this bill requires. Let's make the administration, who has continually held back facts regarding implementation of the health care law, meet their pledge to be the most transparent in history.

I urge my colleagues to vote for this bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 3362, the Exchange Information Disclosure Act. There is widespread agreement that the ObamaCare rollout was a failure. Most of us believe the administration's lack of transparency and candor with Congress and the American people caused most of the problems.

Since the beginning of the rollout, I have pressed the administration to release enrollment data to Congress. That data, including who is actually enrolling and what the mix of those who signed up looks like, are the kinds of hard facts we need before us to evaluate how this fundamental restructuring of our health care is really operating.

Yet the administration did not provide that long-promised transparency. Instead, I was forced to subpoena the administration to get any information. While I received some of what I requested, it is not enough for Congress to understand the true impact of this law.

It is clear that, more than halfway through the enrollment, the administration is failing to meet its own goal of 7 million enrollees by March 31.

Last week, the administration released data that showed it has failed to meet an even more important goal—the right mix of young and healthy enrollees. The reality is that you need a good balance of young and healthy individuals in order to offset the more expensive costs of those who are older and less healthy.

Without enough young and healthy enrollees, millions of Americans, including those who have had their plan canceled as a result of the President's broken promise, will see higher costs and fewer choices. With the little data we have, we can see this is actually what is happening.

The American people deserve better than the administration's empty promises. They deserve to know what is really going on. Additionally, the administration has not provided any information on the number of people who have completed enrollment. We don't know how many people have paid their premium.

Taxpayers don't know how many people are receiving tax credits. There is no harm to national security if the administration provides this information to Congress, the media, and the American people; but there may be harm to an individual's health security if their interests aren't protected.

Frankly, I believe this administration cares more about implementing this law than protecting the health care of American families.

The American people have every right to know this information and the future of their health care. Having this data will not change the President's broken promise that “if you like your plan, you can keep it,” or his promise that families will see a \$2,500 reduction in their premiums.

□ 1100

However, it will undoubtedly affect Americans' health care future. This is not just arbitrary data. This information will determine how much premiums will increase next year, whether access to care will become more limited, how many insurers may no longer offer coverage, and whether or not you can keep seeing your current doctor.

This administration's failed rollout has given the American people little confidence that they can effectively oversee the overhaul of one-sixth of the economy. What possible reason, other than politics, could there be for the administration not releasing this information? This is data that Congress and the American people deserve to know

and that the administration should readily and willingly provide.

I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support this bill today, and I call on the Senate to take quick action to move this commonsense legislation forward.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LEVIN. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I think informed people are asking why are we taking up this bill this morning. I guess one reason is the Republicans will do anything they can to undermine ACA. Indeed, the more it is successful, the more desperate they become.

The administration says it quite clearly:

To implement this new reporting system, contracts may need to be modified and new staff would need to be hired on an expedited basis, adding millions of dollars in costs to States and the Federal Government, without additional funding from the Congress, for information that is already largely being provided on a monthly basis, consistent with other publicly funded health care programs.

Maybe a second reason we are taking up this bill is because the Republicans in this House think there is nothing else to do. This bill is going nowhere in the Senate, and you know that. You know that. But there is something else that we should be doing.

We are leaving here for 11 days. The House Republicans have said we are not going to be in session next week. 1.5 million Americans have lost their unemployment insurance because of inaction from this House of Representatives. Next week, 72,000 more will be added to the 1.5 million people, 50,000 in the State from which Mr. CAMP and I come, 50,000 left out in the cold—left out in the cold—left, really, to their own devices, without a single bit of assistance that they really worked for. These are people out of work through no fault of their own, looking for work, and essentially they get, from this institution, action this morning on a bill going nowhere when there is somewhere we should be going.

I think this morning represents maybe more vividly than in recent times a reprehensible distortion of priorities of the majority in this House. There are 50,000 people in Michigan looking for work at a time when there remains a historically high percentage of the unemployed who are long-term unemployed. There are three people looking for work for every job that is available. And we come forth here with a bill that is going nowhere? Reprehensible. Inexcusable. You can go home.

I suggest you go home and talk—I guess you haven't done this yet—to the long-term unemployed. Every single person who votes for this bill should go home and talk to those out of work and out of luck, because the majority in this institution, in this House, are simply out of synch with the needs of the American people.

We shouldn't vote “no” on this bill, because we need the opportunity to vote “yes” on what really matters.



I reserve the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE. Members are reminded to address their remarks to the Chair and not to others in the second person.

Mr. CAMP. I thank the Chair for that admonition, and I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. YOUNG), the distinguished member of the Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. YOUNG of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, since the launch of open enrollment and healthcare.gov on October 1, I have heard repeated stories of frustration from my constituents trying to enroll in the Federal exchanges.

The President and his administration have tried to assure us time and again that the Web site is improving and that Americans are enrolling.

Unfortunately, neither the stories I have been told, nor the claims of this administration, are easy to verify because HHS is giving us very little data to go off of. Now, that is a shame, because one of the greatest constitutional obligations of the legislative branch is robust oversight of the executive branch—to be sure that laws are working and being enforced as intended.

But there is an even bigger shame here. In August of 2013, HHS estimated that approximately 900,000 individuals in my home State of Indiana were uninsured. This week, HHS offered us a progress report. Now, can you guess how many Hoosiers, according to this report, actually selected a plan through healthcare.gov as of December 28? Only 30,000. Now, that means, according to the HHS estimates, the Obama administration estimates 29 out of every 30 uninsured Hoosiers have not selected a plan through healthcare.gov.

That 30,000 figure, by the way, is suspect in itself, to put it charitably. Since HHS is only reporting those who put a plan in a shopping cart, we don't know how many actually went through with the purchase.

Now, with a big deadline coming up for the individual mandate tax penalty, it is imperative that Congress understands exactly how many people are in compliance with the law. Merely selecting a plan won't help you avoid being taxed by the IRS.

That is why I am a strong supporter of the Exchange Information Disclosure Act. The Obama administration should be required to provide the American people and Congress weekly reports on the status of healthcare.gov. They should be required to tell us how many are actually purchasing plans. They should be required to tell us all sorts of additional data points they are already tracking that will help Congress perform our oversight role on behalf of the American people.

I urge my colleagues to support this measure here in the House and, hopefully, in the Senate.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. CROWLEY), a member of our committee.

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Michigan for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, it is a shame we are not up here considering an extension of the unemployment insurance. American families are looking for some kind of sign that their Congress isn't going to leave town without extending unemployment insurance, and I don't think they are amused by this 48th attempt to undermine health care in our country.

The fact is the legislation before us is supposedly all about the numbers. My colleagues on the other side of the aisle are fixated on the numbers behind the Affordable Care Act. They seem to think they will find numbers that somehow discredit the law and the important benefits it provides. But you know what? It is true that numbers tell an important story, so here are some numbers that actually matter for the American people:

Nine million, that is how many people have already obtained health insurance under the Affordable Care Act—9 million. It is also 9 million people who don't have to worry that a major medical incident could bankrupt them and their families;

Twenty-five million, that is how many seniors on Medicare received free preventive care last year because of the Affordable Care Act—25 million. That is 25 million seniors who can get a mammogram or a cholesterol screening without financial barriers, so that serious diseases can be caught and treated earlier, saving taxpayers' dollars;

Eight million—big number, 8 million—that is how many jobs have been created in this country since the passage of the Affordable Care Act—8 million. That is more than twice as many jobs created than were lost during the 10 years before the Affordable Care Act was enacted.

These are just some of the numbers that tell the true story of the Affordable Care Act, not to mention the number of people with preexisting conditions who can no longer be discriminated against, or the seniors who are seeing reduced prices on their prescription drugs, or the small business owners who now have a way to provide insurance for themselves and their employees.

These are the numbers. These are the numbers that matter to me because the Affordable Care Act is about helping the American people afford care in this country.

So my colleagues on the other side of the aisle can go and play their numbers games as long as they want, but their fixation doesn't add up. These numbers do.

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, how much time is left on either side?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN) has 2½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CAMP) has 3½ minutes remaining.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of our time to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. McDERMOTT).

(Mr. McDERMOTT asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, what we are engaged in today is what I call loving a bill to death. Every legislator knows how you do it. You load it up with a bunch of stuff to kill it. They are still trying to do this. They are not talking about transparency or accountability. It is simply another plan to muck up the path to better health for Americans.

It is not surprising, because the House Republicans don't want a health care system that works any more than they want a balanced budget. If they wanted a balanced budget, they wouldn't push for health care policies that cost more to get less.

America spends more on health care than any other advanced nation, and we get worse outcomes. Let me tell you one of the reasons for that. We spend less on social services. Instead of helping people afford good food to stay in shape, we cut food stamps. Instead of supporting families who care for their parents in the comfort of their home, we force them to push them into nursing homes. Instead of helping people to stay in their homes, instead of strengthening the bridge between job and new career, we pull the rug out from under them.

And right now, every 8 seconds, another American loses his unemployment insurance. While I am speaking, 15 families will lose their way of supporting themselves.

Where do these people go? How do they stay healthy? Is it any wonder our diet is full of what we call comfort food? And is it any wonder that we are the most anxious country in the world? Is it any wonder that the ER has become more common than the doctor's office?

We can pay now. We can invest in a country where people have jobs. We can help people keep their homes and care for themselves, or we will pay later in skyrocketing health care costs and the economic drag of a sick nation.

□ 1115

If Republicans wanted a health care system that works, we would be investing, not wasting our time in forcing States and the Federal Government to spend more on useless bureaucracy.

Nobody is asking for this. Maybe the insurance companies want to have more data. I don't know. But nobody who is administering this program has said, Let's have more reports. We don't know enough.

It is like babies; you don't weigh them every day to see if they have gained weight. You take them in every couple of months or every month to get the baby checked. That is what we are doing here already. And they say, No, let's do it every day. Let's do it every week. Let's waste more time and money.

Vote “no” on this wasteful, destructive bill.

Mr. CAMP. I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, the reason this legislation is important is that, from what little information we do have, we know the administration is not meeting their stated goals, and they are not on track to meet 7 million people by March 31. We don't know the mix of people that have enrolled. We don't know how many of them are young and healthy. We don't know how many of them have paid a premium. The reason these things are important for us to know and to track is, this is a big deal. This is one-sixth of the American economy. There is probably no legislative area that affects people more than their health care.

The reason we have to know this information is because if they aren't meeting their stated goals and their projections in terms of the cost of this bill, it could mean that people's premiums skyrocket next year. It could mean that the physician that they are used to seeing and being treated by, many times for an ongoing illness, may not be available to them under their insurance plan.

So these are important issues. These are important benchmarks for us to know. It is important for the American people to know. It is important for the media to know. Because then, if we can understand what is really happening as we are in the middle of this, constructive changes could be made to this bill. What they want to do is keep us in the dark. They say vote “no.” Make sure we don't know what is going on, and then we will have a health care crisis even greater than the one we have now.

So I urge a “yes” vote on this bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the Exchange Information Disclosure Act. This legislation is needed because of what we know and what we do not know.

Congress has repeatedly asked this administration for information about the rollout of Obamacare. We know this administration is not transparent. We know this administration has not been forthcoming or willing to acknowledge problems. The administration repeatedly came before Congress and testified the exchange was ready. Now know the federal exchange was not ready and there is mounting evidence just how early the administration knew.

We know enrollment is in serious trouble. Based on the Administration's projections, December enrollment was over 1 million people below their own goal. At the current pace, enrollment for 2014 will fall over 2.4 million people short of the Administration's own projections. They project they need 38 percent of enrollees to be young and healthy, so far only 24 percent are. We know, without the right demographic mix premiums will continue to go up.

This is what we know. But there is a lot we do not know.

We do not know how many people have completed enrollment by actually paying premiums. We need this information to understand just how bad the problem really is. The administration has been unwilling to regularly

release data about enrollments; instead we get limited, sterilized data of the administration's choosing provided on seemingly random dates.

Our health care system is facing a crisis, and Congress needs to be a full partner with the Administration in fixing this disaster. For that, we need the raw data, we need the hard truths and we need to know what the administration knows, when they know it. This bill requires weekly reports of all of the important data. This bill is needed if Congress is going to be able to do its job for the American people.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 455, the previous question is ordered on the bill, as amended.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

#### MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion to recommit at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentlewoman opposed to the bill?

Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts. I am.

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, I reserve a point of order against the motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. A point of order is reserved.

The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Add at the end of the bill the following new section:

The SPEAKER pro tempore. A point of order is reserved. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts moves to recommit the bill H.R. 3362 to the Committee on Energy and Commerce with instructions to report the bill back to the House forthwith with the following amendment:

Add at the end of the bill the following new section:

#### SEC. 5. DISCLOSURE OF LOWER COSTS AND ADDITIONAL HEALTH BENEFITS PROVIDED TO INDIVIDUALS AND FAMILIES.

Not later than 5 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, and every month thereafter through March 2015, the Secretary of Health and Human Services shall submit to Congress and make available to State governors, State insurance commissioners, and the public a report containing information, with respect to individuals and families enrolling in health insurance coverage through an Exchange established under title I of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act, on each of the following:

(1) The number of such individuals and families who have received premium tax credits or have lower out-of-pocket costs.

(2) The number of such individuals and families who are no longer subject to discrimination based on pre-existing conditions.

(3) The number of such individuals and families who are no longer subject to annual and lifetime limits on health insurance coverage.

(4) The number of such individuals and families who were uninsured prior to enrolling in health insurance coverage through such an Exchange.

Nothing in this Act shall limit the ability of the Secretary of Health and Human Services

to inform individuals and families of the lower costs for health insurance coverage and additional benefits that are available pursuant to the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act and title I and subtitle B of title II of the Health Care and Education Reconciliation Act of 2010.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from Massachusetts is recognized for 5 minutes in support of her motion.

Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

This is the final amendment to the bill. This amendment will not kill the bill; and should it pass, the House will immediately take up the bill, as amended.

Mr. Speaker, having just been sworn in a month ago, may I first say, it is an honor to serve the Fifth District of Massachusetts. My district is looking to us to focus on jobs, rebuild the economy, and extend unemployment benefits. Instead, Republicans have scheduled the 48th vote to undermine the Affordable Care Act.

We have a job to do. We have to ensure that the hardworking families we serve are able to navigate the health care law and are able to make informed decisions about their health care coverage. Our job is to ensure that should problems arise, we are able to direct resources toward a timely fix.

Some of my colleagues believe that an increase in transparency will help us achieve those goals. So why not do that? Why not let Americans know exactly what has been going on since this law has been implemented? Why not let people understand all facets of this law? I support transparency and making the law the best it can be for millions of families and children who will benefit from it.

I know firsthand how good this reform will be for the American people because I watched it happen in my own State. In 2006, Massachusetts implemented health care reform which today is benefiting hundreds of thousands of families. It took hard work, and it meant lawmakers who didn't always agree on everything had to work together to do right by those they served. Today, 98 percent of the people in Massachusetts are benefiting from some form of health care coverage.

Because I was not yet elected last fall, like millions of Americans, I watched from home as the destructive and irresponsible fight against the ACA shut our government down. It is time to stop the obstruction over this issue and get back to work for the American people.

If our goal is truly transparency—not just harassment to make sure the law never works—why not give the full picture? Let's give families and businesses all of the information they need regarding what is available to them, as well as what we are going to do to make the law work better.

My motion to recommit will better inform those we serve with facts about the benefits which millions of American families are seeking. My amendment will provide the full picture, not just data handpicked to support a partisan argument.

This includes information regarding how many families and individuals have received tax credits. It will include disclosures on the number of Americans who are no longer subject to discrimination based on preexisting conditions. Families at home will know how many people are no longer subject to annual and lifetime limits on coverage. They will know how many people who were previously uninsured are now able to access health care and plan for the future.

If we are to do right by those we serve—do what we were elected to do, which is to make health care reform work for the American people—then we should spare the partisan agendas and pass this commonsense amendment.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my point of order, and I claim the time in opposition to the motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The point of order is withdrawn.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, opponents of the Exchange Information Disclosure Act argue that HHS is already reporting data. Yet more than 3 months after the disastrous launch of the exchanges, we simply do not know how many Americans have actually completed enrollment by paying their first month's premium. As Secretary Sebelius acknowledged at an Energy and Commerce Committee hearing in December, enrollment in an exchange is not complete until the first month's premium has been paid.

The administration so far has refused to tell the American people how many people are actually enrolled in the health care law's exchanges. Either the administration is refusing to tell us how many people are actually enrolled or they simply do not know. Neither answer should instill confidence in a law that puts over 2 trillion taxpayer dollars on the line.

This underlying bill would require the administration to give us real and actual enrollment data. The American people deserve transparency, and this is what the Exchange Information Disclosure Act would deliver. I urge all Members to oppose this motion to recommit and vote for the underlying bill.

I yield back the balance of my time. The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, the Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the minimum

time for any electronic vote on the question of passage.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 186, nays 226, not voting 20, as follows:

[Roll No. 22]

YEAS—186

|               |                |                  |
|---------------|----------------|------------------|
| Andrews       | Green, Al      | Negrete McLeod   |
| Barber        | Green, Gene    | Nolan            |
| Barrow (GA)   | Grijalva       | O'Rourke         |
| Bass          | Gutiérrez      | Pallone          |
| Beatty        | Hahn           | Pascarell        |
| Becerra       | Hanabusa       | Pastor (AZ)      |
| Bera (CA)     | Hastings (FL)  | Payne            |
| Bishop (GA)   | Heck (WA)      | Pelosi           |
| Bishop (NY)   | Higgins        | Perlmutter       |
| Blumenauer    | Himes          | Peters (CA)      |
| Bonamici      | Holt           | Peters (MI)      |
| Brady (PA)    | Honda          | Peterson         |
| Braley (IA)   | Horsford       | Pingree (ME)     |
| Brown (FL)    | Hoyer          | Pocan            |
| Brownley (CA) | Israel         | Polis            |
| Bustos        | Jackson Lee    | Price (NC)       |
| Butterfield   | Jeffries       | Quigley          |
| Capps         | Johnson (GA)   | Rahall           |
| Capuano       | Johnson, E. B. | Rangel           |
| Cárdenas      | Kaptur         | Richmond         |
| Carney        | Keating        | Roybal-Allard    |
| Cartwright    | Kelly (IL)     | Ryan (OH)        |
| Castor (FL)   | Kennedy        | Sanchez, Linda   |
| Castro (TX)   | Kildee         | T.               |
| Chu           | Kilmer         | Sanchez, Loretta |
| Cicilline     | Kind           | Sarbanes         |
| Clark (MA)    | Kirkpatrick    | Schakowsky       |
| Clarke (NY)   | Kuster         | Schiff           |
| Clay          | Langevin       | Schneider        |
| Clyburn       | Larsen (WA)    | Schrader         |
| Cohen         | Larson (CT)    | Schwartz         |
| Connolly      | Lee (CA)       | Scott (VA)       |
| Conyers       | Levin          | Scott, David     |
| Cooper        | Lewis          | Serrano          |
| Costa         | Lipinski       | Sewell (AL)      |
| Courtney      | Loebach        | Shea-Porter      |
| Crowley       | Lofgren        | Sherman          |
| Cuellar       | Lowenthal      | Sinema           |
| Cummings      | Lowe           | Sires            |
| Davis (CA)    | Lujan Grisham  | Smith (WA)       |
| Davis, Danny  | (NM)           | Speier           |
| DeFazio       | Lujan, Ben Ray | Swalwell (CA)    |
| DeGette       | (NM)           | Takano           |
| Delaney       | Lynch          | Thompson (CA)    |
| DeLauro       | Maffei         | Thompson (MS)    |
| DelBene       | Maloney,       | Tierney          |
| Deutch        | Carolyn        | Titus            |
| Doyle         | Maloney, Sean  | Tonko            |
| Duckworth     | Matheson       | Tsongas          |
| Edwards       | Matsui         | Van Hollen       |
| Ellison       | McCollum       | Vargas           |
| Engel         | McDermott      | Veasey           |
| Enyart        | McGovern       | Vela             |
| Eshoo         | McNerney       | Velázquez        |
| Esty          | Meeks          | Visclosky        |
| Farr          | Meng           | Walz             |
| Fattah        | Michaud        | Wasserman        |
| Foster        | Miller, George | Schultz          |
| Frankel (FL)  | Moore          | Waters           |
| Fudge         | Moran          | Waxman           |
| Gallego       | Murphy (FL)    | Welch            |
| Garamendi     | Nadler         | Wilson (FL)      |
| Garcia        | Napolitano     | Yarmuth          |
| Grayson       | Neal           |                  |

NAYS—226

|             |               |               |
|-------------|---------------|---------------|
| Aderholt    | Camp          | Dent          |
| Amash       | Campbell      | DeSantis      |
| Amodei      | Cantor        | DesJarlais    |
| Bachus      | Capito        | Diaz-Balart   |
| Barletta    | Carter        | Duffy         |
| Barr        | Cassidy       | Duncan (SC)   |
| Barton      | Chabot        | Duncan (TN)   |
| Benishek    | Chaffetz      | Ellmers       |
| Bentivolio  | Coble         | Farenthold    |
| Bilirakis   | Coffman       | Fincher       |
| Bishop (UT) | Cole          | Fitzpatrick   |
| Black       | Collins (GA)  | Fleischmann   |
| Blackburn   | Collins (NY)  | Fleming       |
| Boustany    | Conaway       | Flores        |
| Brady (TX)  | Cook          | Forbes        |
| Bridenstine | Cotton        | Fortenberry   |
| Brooks (AL) | Cramer        | Fox           |
| Brooks (IN) | Crawford      | Franks (AZ)   |
| Broun (GA)  | Crenshaw      | Frelinghuysen |
| Bucshon     | Culberson     | Gardner       |
| Burgess     | Daines        | Garrett       |
| Byrne       | Davis, Rodney | Gerlach       |
| Calvert     | Denham        | Gibbs         |

|                 |               |               |
|-----------------|---------------|---------------|
| Gibson          | Marchant      | Rooney        |
| Gingrey (GA)    | Marino        | Ros-Lehtinen  |
| Gohmert         | Massie        | Roskam        |
| Goodlatte       | McAllister    | Ross          |
| Gosar           | McCarthy (CA) | Rothfus       |
| Gowdy           | McCaul        | Royce         |
| Granger         | McClintock    | Runyan        |
| Graves (GA)     | McHenry       | Ryan (WI)     |
| Graves (MO)     | McIntyre      | Salmon        |
| Griffin (AR)    | McKeon        | Sanford       |
| Griffith (VA)   | McKinley      | Scalise       |
| Grimm           | McMorris      | Schock        |
| Guthrie         | Rodgers       | Schweikert    |
| Hall            | Meadows       | Scott, Austin |
| Hanna           | Meehan        | Sensenbrenner |
| Harper          | Messer        | Sessions      |
| Harris          | Mica          | Shimkus       |
| Hartzler        | Miller (MI)   | Shuster       |
| Hastings (WA)   | Miller, Gary  | Simpson       |
| Heck (NV)       | Mullin        | Smith (MO)    |
| Hensarling      | Mulvaney      | Smith (NE)    |
| Herrera Beutler | Murphy (PA)   | Smith (TX)    |
| Holding         | Neugebauer    | Southerland   |
| Hudson          | Nugent        | Stewart       |
| Huelskamp       | Nunes         | Stivers       |
| Huizenga (MI)   | Nunnelee      | Stutzman      |
| Hultgren        | Olson         | Terry         |
| Hunter          | Owens         | Thompson (PA) |
| Hurt            | Palazzo       | Thornberry    |
| Issa            | Paulsen       | Tiberi        |
| Jenkins         | Pearce        | Tipton        |
| Johnson (OH)    | Perry         | Turner        |
| Johnson, Sam    | Petri         | Upton         |
| Jordan          | Pittenger     | Valadao       |
| Joyce           | Pitts         | Wagner        |
| Kelly (PA)      | Poe (TX)      | Walberg       |
| King (IA)       | Pompeo        | Walden        |
| King (NY)       | Posey         | Walorski      |
| Kingston        | Price (GA)    | Weber (TX)    |
| Kinzing (IL)    | Radel         | Webster (FL)  |
| Kline           | Reed          | Wenstrup      |
| Labrador        | Reichert      | Westmoreland  |
| LaMalfa         | Renacci       | Whitfield     |
| Lamborn         | Ribble        | Williams      |
| Lance           | Rice (SC)     | Wilson (SC)   |
| Lankford        | Rigell        | Wittman       |
| Latham          | Roby          | Womack        |
| Latta           | Roe (TN)      | Woodall       |
| LoBiondo        | Rogers (AL)   | Yoder         |
| Long            | Rogers (KY)   | Yoho          |
| Lucas           | Rogers (MI)   | Young (AK)    |
| Luetkemeyer     | Rohrabacher   | Young (IN)    |
| Lummis          | Rokita        |               |

NOT VOTING—20

|             |               |               |
|-------------|---------------|---------------|
| Bachmann    | Hinojosa      | Ruppersberger |
| Buchanan    | Huffman       | Rush          |
| Carson (IN) | Jones         | Slaughter     |
| Cleaver     | McCarthy (NY) | Smith (NJ)    |
| Dingell     | Miller (FL)   | Stockman      |
| Doggett     | Noem          | Wolf          |
| Gabbard     | Ruiz          |               |

□ 1151

Messrs. ROGERS of Michigan, RICE of South Carolina, ROGERS of Kentucky, WHITFIELD, STIVERS, and FORTENBERRY changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Mrs. KIRKPATRICK and Mr. PETERSON changed their vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 259, nays 154, not voting 19, as follows:

[Roll No. 23]

## YEAS—259

Aderholt Gowdy Pearce  
 Amash Granger Perry  
 Amodei Graves (GA) Peters (CA)  
 Bachmann Graves (MO) Peterson  
 Bachus Griffin (AR) Petri  
 Barber Griffith (VA) Pittenger  
 Barletta Grimm Pitts  
 Barr Guthrie Poe (TX)  
 Barrow (GA) Hall Pompeo  
 Barton Hanna Posey  
 Benishek Harper Price (GA)  
 Bentivolio Harris Radel  
 Bera (CA) Hartzler Rahall  
 Bilirakis Hastings (WA) Reed  
 Bishop (UT) Heck (NV) Reichert  
 Black Hensarling Renacci  
 Blackburn Herrera Beutler Ribble  
 Boustany Holding Rice (SC)  
 Brady (TX) Hudson Rigell  
 Braley (IA) Huelskamp Roby  
 Bridenstine Huiuzenga (MI) Roe (TN)  
 Brooks (AL) Hultgren Rogers (AL)  
 Brooks (IN) Hunter Rogers (KY)  
 Broun (GA) Hurt Rogers (MI)  
 Brownley (CA) Issa Rohrabacher  
 Bucshon Jenkins Rokita  
 Burgess Johnson (OH) Rooney  
 Bustos Johnson, Sam Ros-Lehtinen  
 Byrne Jordan Roskam  
 Calvert Joyce Ross  
 Camp Kelly (PA) Rothfus  
 Campbell King (IA) Royce  
 Cantor King (NY) Runyan  
 Capito Kingston Ryan (WI)  
 Capps Kinzinger (IL) Salmon  
 Carter Kline Sanford  
 Cassidy Kuster Scalise  
 Chabot Labrador Schneider  
 Chaffetz LaMalfa Schock  
 Coble Lamborn Schrader  
 Coffman Lance Schweikert  
 Cole Lankford Scott, Austin  
 Collins (GA) Latham Sensenbrenner  
 Collins (NY) Latta Sessions  
 Conaway LoBiondo Shea-Porter  
 Cook Loebuck Shimkus  
 Cooper Long Shuster  
 Costa Lucas Simpson  
 Cotton Luetkemeyer Sinema  
 Cramer Lujan Grisham Sires  
 Crawford (NM) Smith (MO)  
 Crenshaw Lummis Smith (NE)  
 Culberson Maffei Smith (NJ)  
 Daines Maloney, Sean Smith (TX)  
 Davis, Rodney Marchant Southerland  
 Denham Marino Stewart  
 Dent Massie Stivers  
 DeSantis Matheson Stutzman  
 DesJarlais McAllister Terry  
 Diaz-Balart McCarthy (CA) Thompson (PA)  
 Duffy McCaul Thornberry  
 Duncan (SC) McClintock Tiberi  
 Duncan (TN) McHenry Tipton  
 Ellmers McIntyre Turner  
 Enyart McKeon Upton  
 Farenthold McKinley Valadao  
 Fincher McMorris Vargas  
 Fitzpatrick Rodgers Vela  
 Fleischmann Meadows Wagner  
 Fleming Meehan Walberg  
 Flores Messer Walden  
 Forbes Mica Walorski  
 Fortenberry Michaud Walz  
 Foxx Miller (MI) Weber (TX)  
 Franks (AZ) Miller, Gary Webster (FL)  
 Frelinghuysen Mullin Wenstrup  
 Gallego Mulvaney Westmoreland  
 Garcia Murphy (FL) Whitfield  
 Gardner Murphy (PA) Williams  
 Garrett Neugebauer Wilson (SC)  
 Gerlach Nugent Wittman  
 Gibbs Nunes Womack  
 Gibson Nunnelee Woodall  
 Gingrey (GA) O'Rourke Yoder  
 Gohmert Olson Yoho  
 Goodlatte Palazzo Young (AK)  
 Gosar Paulsen Young (IN)

## NAYS—154

Andrews Bonamici Cartwright  
 Bass Brady (PA) Castro (TX)  
 Beatty Brown (FL) Chu  
 Becerra Butterfield Cicilline  
 Bishop (GA) Capuano Clark (MA)  
 Bishop (NY) Cardenas Clarke (NY)  
 Blumenauer Carney Clay

Clyburn Jeffries Pelosi  
 Cohen Johnson (GA) Perlmutter  
 Connolly Johnson, E. B. Peters (MI)  
 Conyers Kaptur Pingree (ME)  
 Courtney Keating Pocan  
 Crowley Kelly (IL) Polis  
 Cuellar Kennedy Price (NC)  
 Cummings Kildee Quigley  
 Davis (CA) Kilmer Rangel  
 Davis, Danny Kind Richmond  
 DeFazio Kirkpatrick Roybal-Allard  
 DeGette Langevin Ryan (OH)  
 Delaney Larsen (WA) Sanchez, Linda  
 DeLauro Larson (CT) T.  
 DelBene Lee (CA) Sanchez, Loretta  
 Deutch Levin Sarbanes  
 Doyle Lewis Schakowsky  
 Duckworth Lipinski Schiff  
 Edwards Lofgren Schwartz  
 Ellison Lowenthal Scott (VA)  
 Engel Lowey Scott, David  
 Eshoo Lujan, Ben Ray Serrano  
 Esty (NM) Lynch Sewell (AL)  
 Farr Maloney, Sherman  
 Fattah Carolyn Smith (WA)  
 Foster Frankel (FL) Speier  
 Frankel (FL) Matsui Swalwell (CA)  
 Fudge McCollum Takano  
 Garamendi McDermott Thompson (CA)  
 Grayson McGovern Thompson (MS)  
 Green, Al McNeerney Tierney  
 Green, Gene Meeks Titus  
 Grijalva Meng Tonko  
 Hahn Miller, George Tsongas  
 Hanabusa Moore Van Hollen  
 Hastings (FL) Moran Veasey  
 Heck (WA) Nadler Velázquez  
 Higgins Napolitano Visclosky  
 Himes Neal Wasserman  
 Holt Negrete McLeod Schultz  
 Honda Nolan Waters  
 Horsford Owens Waxman  
 Hoyer Pallone Welch  
 Huffman Pascrell Wilson (FL)  
 Israel Pastor (AZ) Yarmuth  
 Jackson Lee Payne

## NOT VOTING—19

Buchanan Gutiérrez Ruppertsberger  
 Carson (IN) Hinojosa Rush  
 Castor (FL) Jones Slaughter  
 Cleaver McCarthy (NY) Stockman  
 Dingell Miller (FL) Wolf  
 Doggett Noem  
 Gabbard Ruiz

□ 1200

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. CLEAVER. Mr. Speaker, due to a medical procedure, I was unable to vote the week of January 13, 2014. On Monday, January 13, had I been present, I would have voted "yes" on rollcall vote 12 (H.R. 1513), and "yes" on rollcall vote 13 (S. 230).

On January 14, had I been present, I would have voted "yes" on rollcall vote 14 (H.R. 2274), "yes" on rollcall vote 15 (H.R. 801), "yes" on rollcall vote 16 (Journal), "yes" on rollcall vote 17 (H.R. 2860), and "yes" on rollcall vote 18 (H.R. 1233).

On January 15, had I been present, I would have voted "no" on rollcall vote 19 (Previous Question on H.R. 1233), "no" on rollcall vote 20 (H. Res. 458), and "yes" on rollcall vote 21 (H.R. 3547).

On January 16, had I been present, I would have voted "yes" on rollcall vote 22 (Motion to Recommit H.R. 3362) and "no" on rollcall vote 23 (H.R. 3362).

## PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained and missed rollcall vote Nos. 22 and 23. Had I been present, I would have voted "yes" on rollcall vote No. 22 and "no" on rollcall vote No. 23.

## PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, today I attended the funeral of Army Sergeant, First Class William Kelly Lacey, a fallen soldier from my district, and missed the following rollcall votes: Nos. 22 and 23 on January 16, 2014.

If present, I would have voted: rollcall vote No 22—On Motion to Recommit with Instructions, H.R. 3362, Exchange Information Disclosure Act, "nay;" rollcall vote No. 23—H.R. 3362, Exchange Information Disclosure Act, "aye."

## PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. CARSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, on January 16, 2014, I missed rollcall votes 22 and 23 because of district business. Had I been present, I would have voted "yes" on rollcall 22 and "no" on rollcall 23.

## APPOINTMENT OF MEMBER TO BOARD OF VISITORS TO UNITED STATES NAVAL ACADEMY

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois). The Chair announces the Speaker's appointment, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 6968(a), and the order of the House of January 3, 2014, of the following Member on the part of the House to the Board of Visitors to the United States Naval Academy:

Mr. MIKE ROGERS, Michigan

## ELECTING A MEMBER TO A CERTAIN STANDING COMMITTEE OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. BECERRA. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Democratic Caucus, I offer a privileged resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 460

*Resolved*, That the following named Member be and is hereby elected to the following standing committee of the House of Representatives:

(1) COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY.—Mr. Cicilline.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## PROVIDING FOR A JOINT SESSION OF CONGRESS TO RECEIVE A MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Speaker, I send to the desk a privileged concurrent resolution and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the concurrent resolution, as follows:

H. CON. RES. 75

*Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring)*, That the two Houses of Congress assemble in the Hall of the House of Representatives on Tuesday, January 28, 2014, at 9 p.m., for the purpose of receiving such communication as the President of the United States shall be pleased to make to them.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

# HOUR OF MEETING ON TOMORROW

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 1 p.m. tomorrow.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

## CAREER AND TECHNICAL EDUCATION

(Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, Congressman JIM LANGEVIN and I serve as the cochair for the bipartisan Career and Technical Education, or the CTE, Caucus.

During the two previous Congresses, we worked to raise awareness of the importance of career and technical education. We have also led the charge to ensure that CTE programs receive robust funding.

For nearly a decade, CTE programs were largely marginalized, receiving level funding and even taking sizable reductions. The CTE Caucus, in turn, has advocated for maintaining funding levels for CTE programs. We are pleased that yesterday the House passed modest funding increases for CTE programs. This is a good start.

Mr. Speaker, with so many unemployed or underemployed in this country, it is time for us to take a more strategic approach to helping Americans get back to work. We can no longer afford to undervalue CTE. In fact, we will only succeed if career and technical education is an essential element of our strategy.

Mr. Speaker, I would like, as a point of personal privilege, a valued House staff member, Trudi Terry, is retiring before we return from this coming week's recess. I want to thank her for her service to this country.

Thank you, Trudi.

## CAREER AND TECHNICAL EDUCATION

(Mr. LANGEVIN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LANGEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I join my colleague, Congressman "GT" THOMPSON from Pennsylvania, as co-chairs of the bipartisan Career and Technical Education Caucus in commending House appropriators and my colleagues for the increase in Perkins Act funding for career and technical education funding.

This funding is vitally important for training the next generation of workers who will enter the career and technical education fields. These are good-paying jobs. At a time where Rhode Island—my home State—has one of the highest unemployment rates in the

country, this funding for career and technical education could not come at a more critical time.

It is frustrating to see so many people out of work. Yet when you talk to businesses around our State and around the country, one of the main things that they found a real challenge is finding the people with the right skills to do the jobs that are available right now.

So by focusing on these areas of career and technical education, whether it be in IT or woodworking or culinary or engineering, these are vitally important jobs in our communities, in our country, and they are going to do a lot to get people back to work.

I want to thank my colleagues for their support of Perkins Act funding and career and technical education programs.

I, again, thank my colleague, Congressman "GT" THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, for the bipartisan effort that he and I have put into this vitally important area.

## BETTER CARE, LOWER COST ACT

(Mr. PAULSEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PAULSEN. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, I along with PETER WELCH, my colleague, and Senators WYDEN and ISAKSON introduced the Better Care, Lower Cost Act, bipartisan legislation to truly bend the cost curve and improve chronic care management in Medicare.

Medicare today, Mr. Speaker, is very different than it was in 1965, as 68 percent of all beneficiaries have two or more chronic conditions, which account now for 93 percent of all Medicare costs.

Our legislation will help seniors like Darlene from my district, who suffers from multiple chronic conditions, including arthritis and diabetes. The complexity involved with gaining input from her many doctors and nurses makes it very difficult for her to manage her own health. This is a difficulty that many seniors typically face today.

But by modernizing the Medicare payment system—paying for results, not just activity; incentivizing people to take care of themselves; and removing the barriers to innovation—we can ensure that seniors get the right care at the right time.

We can also take advantage of health care technology, like telehealth. We can break down the barriers, the geographic barriers, to bring chronic care management skills and experience of institutions like the Mayo Clinic in Minnesota to light.

Mr. Speaker, we can create a better system, and this bipartisan group shows that it can be done with a little cooperation and collaboration.

# RECOGNIZING THE FOURTH ANNIVERSARY OF THE HAITIAN EARTHQUAKE

(Ms. CLARKE of New York asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. CLARKE of New York. Mr. Speaker, I stand here before you to acknowledge, and in remembrance of, the fourth anniversary of the catastrophic earthquake in Haiti in January 2010. I come in honor and in awe of the unmitigated strength, hope, and faith of the Haitian people.

Although there is still significant progress to be made, let us take this time to remember those who have died and those who continue living with the visible and invisible scars of trauma.

We cannot forget those who still remain in IDP camps, subject to forced evictions, and living in squalid and precarious conditions. We must remember those who are victims of sexual and gender-based violence, and we cannot turn a blind eye on those Haitians suffering from cholera, which was introduced to the country through no fault of their own.

Mr. Speaker, the passion of the Haitian people continues to inspire a sense of community, generosity, strength, and drive throughout the Caribbean diaspora.

Therefore, I urge my colleagues to draw on the energy, will, and determination of the Haitian people and continue to fight to help Haiti to truly recover from the devastating earthquake of 2010.

## CONCEPTION

(Mr. SHUSTER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, I gave a speech on the floor drawing attention to the important pro-life rally that is occurring in Washington next week.

At one point, I misspoke, but today I want to make it crystal clear that life begins at conception.

I am proud of my record fighting and voting to protect the right of the unborn.

Yesterday, we also passed an important appropriations bill to move our Nation in a financially sound way. Four years in a row, we have reduced spending. It is the first time since the Korean war. But equally important, in that bill, it keeps in place laws that protect the life of the unborn. For that, I am very proud of that vote we took yesterday.

## URGING CONGRESS TO RENEW UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE

(Ms. FRANKEL of Florida asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)



Ms. FRANKEL of Florida. Mr. Speaker, Dana Haverman from my home State of Florida is frightened.

Despite the fact that she got her first job at age 15, despite the fact that she worked continuously her entire adult life, despite the fact that at age 60 she lost a long-time job because of this country's economic downturn, despite the fact that she has been looking for a job every day and has not found one, despite all these facts, this Congress has failed to extend emergency unemployment insurance that would give her and thousands of Floridians a little bit of help in paying their electricity and water bills until they find their next job.

Mr. Speaker, let us vote today to extend relief deserved by America's job seekers.

Mr. Speaker, Dana Haverman from my home State of Florida is frightened.

#### EMERGENCY UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION EXTENSION ACT

(Mr. TONKO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. TONKO. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, I and a number of our colleagues in the House asked for unanimous consent to bring up H.R. 3824, the Emergency Unemployment Compensation Extension Act, for a simple up or down vote. Time and time again, we were denied that simple vote.

Mr. Speaker, poll after poll shows us that Independents, Republicans, and Democrats support at least a 3-month extension of unemployment insurance. We continue to be in dereliction of our duty every day we let this critical lifeline to our long-term jobless friends and neighbors expire.

Last week, I met with two New Yorkers from my district who paid into this program for years, and they are shocked, as am I, Mr. Speaker, that elected officials in Washington continue to sit idly by without supporting them.

A simple up or down vote, that is all we are asking for, Mr. Speaker. Let's pass this critical lifeline; let's do what is fair and just; and let's get back to the business of growing jobs and our economy.

□ 1215

#### SAFE CLIMATE CAUCUS

(Mr. POCAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. POCAN. Mr. Speaker, I am honored to be a part of the Safe Climate Caucus and to speak on the urgent need to take action on climate change.

The effects of climate change are undeniable, and their consequences are unavoidable without action, which means action by Congress.

In my home State of Wisconsin, farmers could face more pests and widespread disease from higher humidity and warmer winter temperatures. Ice fishermen are already noticing fewer days they can be out on our ice-covered lakes. By 2055, winters in Wisconsin are expected to be 7 to 9 degrees warmer, and by the middle of the century, extreme heat in Wisconsin, which is responsible for more deaths in my State than any other natural disaster combined, will be more prevalent, with up to a month more of 90-degree-plus days.

These types of dramatic shifts must be met with equally big changes in our behaviors. We must continue to push for alternatives to fossil fuels like oil and coal. We must reduce our emissions and accurately assess their true costs, and we must boost our energy efficiency by investing in clean energy manufacturing for our environment and for our jobs.

#### SYRIA

(Ms. LEE of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. LEE of California. Mr. Speaker, as one of two congressional representatives to the United Nations, I rise to recognize and talk about the continued human suffering in Syria.

According to the United Nations, there are over 2 million registered refugees from Syria, including 1.4 million children. Last September, the United Nations Security Council urged Syria to take immediate steps to grant aid organizations full access to conduct relief operations. Yet, today, there are reports that the government continues to block aid to victims desperately in need of relief, causing needless hunger and suffering among Syria's civilian populations. These actions are not just an offense against our conscience; they are also offenses against international law and United Nations' obligations.

As world leaders gather next week in pursuit of a political solution, we must hold all parties to the Syrian conflict accountable and find a negotiated settlement to ending this crisis once and for all through the hard work of diplomacy.

I am proud that the United States is the leading donor of humanitarian aid, and I am pleased that the omnibus bill we passed yesterday included increased funding to support our ongoing humanitarian response.

#### PASS UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE

(Ms. JACKSON LEE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise to say that we are, in fact, our brothers' and sisters' keeper, and I want to debunk the terrible definition and description of some 1.3—now 1.9—million unemployed Americans.

I reject the theory that they only sit around for unemployment and will not

look for a job unless they are not getting unemployment insurance when everybody knows that the requirements of emergency unemployment insurance require individuals to look for work. For everyone I have spoken to, including learning the story of a woman in New York who is 58 years old and who has looked for work over and over and, likewise, is desperate and devastated because she is not able to provide the bare minimum, I have introduced H.R. 3888.

I ask my colleagues to join me in legislation that will target and train the chronically unemployed, that will provide their unemployment insurance and that will give them a stipend for emerging industry training. I say to my Republican colleagues: if you are interested in jobs, jobs, jobs, join this legislation; but right now, today, let's stay here and vote on unemployment insurance for the millions of Americans who have contributed and shed their blood—many of them veterans, many of them willing to sacrifice. All they need is a helping hand. Pass unemployment insurance.

Where is our heart?

#### THE CITY OF ALPINE

(Mr. GALLEG0 asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GALLEG0. Mr. Speaker, I am sure every Member of Congress thinks that his or her district is the most beautiful, the most unique of all, but the 23rd District in Texas is about 24 percent of the land area of Texas—it is a huge, huge area. I would like to highlight in 1 minute parts of the 23rd, take you around the 23rd in 1 minute. I think it is appropriate to start with the city of Alpine, my hometown.

Alpine is the county seat of Brewster County, which is the largest county in Texas. It is the home of Sul Ross State University. Sul Ross has more national rodeo championships than any other college or university in the Nation, and it is the birthplace of the National Intercollegiate Rodeo Association. If you have the opportunity, look up Brewster County. Look up Alpine.

I am thinking about Alpine a lot as I go home this weekend to address the Chamber of Commerce for my first time as a Member of Congress, and I am so looking forward to being home in the highest, tallest peaks of west Texas.

#### HONORING THE LIVES OF THREE NAVY SAILORS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the gentleman from California (Mr. FARR) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. FARR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the lives of the Navy sailors who were tragically killed in last



week's helicopter crash off the coast of Virginia. The crash touched my office in a personal way.

Petty Officer 3rd Class Brian Andrew Collins was one of the three sailors who lost his life in that crash. He is the brother of one of my staffers, Morgan. My entire staff and I shared her grief as we received the news at work in our office.

Brian was 25 years old. He was born and raised in Truckee, California, and was a graduate of Truckee High School. He was an avid skier, who first strapped on his first pair of skis at the age of 2. He loved to fly down the mountains of California, bouncing in and out of the trees. After high school, Brian briefly attended trade school before deciding to enlist in the military. It was in the Navy that he found his calling.

Brian was a member of the Helicopter Mine Countermeasures Squadron. Those teams patrol the waters to locate and destroy sea-based mines that could harm Navy vessels. Brian loved that mission. He enjoyed jumping out of helicopters and into the water as the team's primary rescue swimmer. It was during his service that he married his wife, Cheyenne. The young couple just celebrated their 1-year anniversary and had bought their first home. They were starting their life together and still had so much to experience. Cheyenne said: "We just scratched the surface."

I will never have the fortune of meeting Brian. However, I feel honored to have gotten to know him through the memories shared by the people he loved. There are few words that can comfort his family and friends in their loss. All I can offer is a sincere and humble "thank you."

Thank you for your service.

Thank you for sharing Brian's story, Cheyenne.

On behalf of all Americans, thank you to all of the military men and women in service.

I ask that this House join me in a moment of silence in honor of the life of Petty Officer 3rd Class Brian Andrew Collins and in honor of his two fellow crewmembers who lost their lives in that crash, Lieutenant Sean Snyder and Lieutenant Wesley Van Dorn.

#### A REDUCTION OF MILITARY FORCES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PERRY) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. PERRY. Mr. Speaker, at this time, I yield to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. ROKITA), my colleague.

OBAMACARE

Mr. ROKITA. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today on behalf of one of my constituents—Janet, from Crawfordsville—pictured here with her husband, Steve. Like millions of our

fellow Americans, she is finding out just how deceptive ObamaCare's cheerleaders were when they sold this insidious law to the American people.

Following surgical treatment for cancer last year, Janet was receiving radiation treatment, and, as if battling a serious illness weren't stressful enough, Janet recently lost her job and was notified that the insurance provided through her severance package would be ending soon. Her family faced the decision to either continue the same coverage under what we call "COBRA" or enroll in an ObamaCare plan. She was skeptical of the process of enrolling in ObamaCare, but as the end date of her employer-sponsored insurance loomed, she was reassured by the news that the President and his team had fixed the technical glitches plaguing healthcare.gov.

Mr. Speaker, I wish I could report that the story ends there on a good note, but it only gets worse, as it does for millions of Americans.

Imagine Janet's frustration when she encountered glitch after glitch throughout the enrollment process. She spent hours on the phone with call center workers, only to find out that the call center workers were as bewildered by the Web site as she was. Several times, she was cut off after holding for over 2 hours.

Mr. Speaker, I would surmise that Members of this Congress get frustrated when holding for a few minutes for anything—2 hours repeatedly, a cancer patient who can't get coverage.

Eventually, Janet had to enroll via the United States mail. This is after taxpayers—and future generations, for that matter, since we borrow 4 percent of what we spend around here—paid nearly \$500 million for a Web site that was supposed to handle a relatively simple sign-up process. Believing she had successfully enrolled, Janet submitted the appropriate payments for her ObamaCare coverage. She paid for it, Mr. Speaker. Unfortunately, Janet did not receive any confirmation that those payments were received or that she had actually enrolled in her plan.

Adding to the uncertainty, neither Obama's bureaucrats nor the insurer can verify her enrollment now. Despite efforts, my staff could not get an answer from the bureaucrats either because of how this law was designed. Meanwhile, Janet continues to receive notices that payment is due, again, adding insult to injury since she already submitted her payment.

It still doesn't end there.

Janet was also informed that she can no longer continue her cancer treatment with her doctor of choice as the provider would only be able to accept certain health care plans off the ObamaCare exchange. The plan Janet chose did not qualify, and it was virtually impossible to verify this during the enrollment period. Janet will have to continue her cancer treatment with a new doctor several times per week. Thankfully, she is allowed to do that,

but the doctor is a 60-mile round trip drive.

ObamaCare has only served to exacerbate already trying and complicated health care issues with bureaucratic red tape and customer service so terrible that it is one only this Federal Government can provide. Like many Hoosiers, Janet was misled by ObamaCare's proponents. Her choices have been severely limited, and she is hardly able to shop around for a doctor she is comfortable with. This is not health care reform. ObamaCare is leading to a health care crisis.

I continue to receive stories from Hoosiers—and I know you do as well—about how ObamaCare has misleadingly done the complete opposite of what was promised. Insurance policies continue to be canceled. Premiums are skyrocketing, and deductibles are soaring. Choice has been reduced, not amplified, and specialty services are in increasingly short supply. In other words, they are being rationed.

I will continue fighting to repeal and replace this insidious law for people like Janet and for millions of Americans in similar situations.

Mr. PERRY. Thank you, Mr. ROKITA.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I rise today to talk about an issue that maybe is unknown to many Members and many citizens but should be known, which is the reduction of forces—the reduction in the capability of our military services across all branches, across the whole spectrum—and how that process is going. It has been my studied opinion at this point that the process is what we should discuss at this time—a process that has lacked transparency, a process that has lacked deliberation.

Now, while it is this Member's belief that the chiefs at the DOD are under significant pressure from an administration to defend this Nation, they are also under significant pressure to make cuts, not only to make those cuts, but to make those cuts in a very particular way. That is part of the discussion today—the cuts to the reserve forces.

□ 1230

Before I recognize some of my colleagues, I just want to provide from the Joint Chiefs the definition of the operational reserve, which is your Guard and Reserve:

As such, the services organize, resource, equip, train, and utilize their Guard and Reserve components to support mission requirements—

This is important:

—to the same standards as their Active components.

To the same standards, which is interesting to me because some of the recent reports and quotes that I have heard are things like it is structured to be complementary, and capabilities in its three components are not interchangeable. So that statement flies in the face of the original definition of what Guard and Reserve forces do.

And things like saying that Guard and Reserve members only train 39 days a year, which, again, I think the

Chiefs are under considerable pressure. DOD is fighting for its life—not among its members but, in my opinion, against an administration; and they are doing what they have to do.

I am an Army soldier. I joined an Army of one, not an Army of some of us get this and some of us get that. We all do the same work together at the same level; and that is the expectation, as it should be. But that is what we are going to discuss for the next hour.

At this time, I yield to my colleague and friend from Pennsylvania (Mr. DENT).

Mr. DENT. Thank you, Representative PERRY. I really appreciate this opportunity to talk about the National Guard.

I first want to start by thanking Congressman PERRY for his service in the Pennsylvania National Guard for some time. He is very committed to our country and committed to the Guard. I commend him for putting this on.

I also want to commend his chief of staff, who is seated right next to him, Colonel Lauren Muglia, who is also an active guardswoman; and I am very proud of her service at Fort Indiantown Gap in Lebanon County, Pennsylvania, at the National Guard center up there, which is located in my congressional district—a very important asset to this country's homeland security and emergency preparedness, as well as any other missions that would be called upon them.

But I have a few things I just wanted to say about the Guard very, very quickly.

The Army's plan for the National Guard includes, frankly, drastic plans to slash the force structure, end strength and aviation assets, and will put the Guard on the back shelf as a strategic reserve. I am very concerned about this. And I know many of my colleagues are as well.

Congress has made a very significant investment in the Guard over the past 12-or-so years to train and equip the Guard as an operational reserve. At a time when the Pentagon must dig very deep for savings in their programs and agencies, the Guard remains a viable investment.

I say this as a member of the Appropriations Committee. We have to make a lot of very hard choices with respect to how we allocate our very limited resources. The Defense Department is coming under a great deal of stress.

But I want you to consider this: the most recent report of the Reserve Forces Policy Board, or RFPB, concluded that a National Guard member costs about one-third of their Active component counterpart. This would translate into nearly \$2.6 billion in savings for every 10,000 positions shifted from a full-time to a part-time status.

What's more, the Army National Guard provides 32 percent of the Army's total personnel and 40 percent of its operating force, while only consuming 11 percent of the Army's budget. That represents a value to this country and, frankly, to the taxpayer.

I mean no disrespect to anybody, but I think we have to understand the real value of this National Guard to the taxpayer.

The Air National Guard provides 19 percent of the Air Force's total personnel and 30 to 40 percent of its overall fighter, tanker, and airlift capacity, at 6 percent of the Air Force budget.

Many of those Air National Guardsmen and pilots are very experienced and have many, many hours of service. So I think we should acknowledge how experienced those folks are.

In conclusion, I just wanted to say that not only does the Guard provide this operational asset to our overall national security and defense structure; but, just as important, it provides an emergency preparedness and homeland security function that they have to help us deal with all the time. In my State, it is usually floods and weather emergencies. The Guard plays an absolutely critical role to help us during those times.

So they have that operational component. They obviously contribute significantly in the wars, and we have seen this, too. By the way, if you have been to Afghanistan or Iraq—and I know some of our colleagues here have served there and paid very heavy prices—frankly, we have seen how well integrated our Guard and Reserve units are with regular Army and regular Air Force units. So I am very proud of that service.

Again, that dual mission—they can help us fight wars and they are certainly a critical component to our over homeland security and emergency preparedness strategy in the country.

With that, I thank Congressman PERRY for his leadership on this issue, and I really appreciate that he put this Special Order together.

Mr. PERRY. Thank you, Representative DENT. I appreciate your comments and I appreciate your support for our Guard.

Again, that is the discussion—a discussion about a process that should be open, that we should have a part in. What we would ask at this point is that the DOD not proceed with the plan until they have had input from everybody involved, which includes our Nation's Guard and Reserve and includes hometown heroes that serve right in every single town, every city, every hamlet, every village across the country, and serve their Nation well.

In this Nation's wars in the last 10 to 15 years, they have been 50 percent of the fighting force. Why haven't we included them in the conversation in a meaningful way?

With that, I would like to again yield to another colleague of mine from Pennsylvania (Mr. ROTHFUS).

Mr. ROTHFUS. I would like to thank my good friend and fellow Pennsylvanian (Mr. PERRY) for hosting this important discussion.

As my colleague Congressman DENT noted, it is Colonel Perry who in 2008 left the comforts of our country to

serve in Iraq. His chief, Lauren Muglia, also is with the National Guard and went overseas for our country.

I rise today in support of the Pennsylvania National Guard and, in particular, the brave soldiers who serve in the 1-104th Attack Reconnaissance Battalion, based in Johnstown, Pennsylvania. Their future, like that of many other National Guard units across the Commonwealth, is being placed in serious jeopardy as part of the Army's most recent force structure plan.

Major General Wesley Craig, the adjutant general for the Pennsylvania National Guard, put it best when he wrote in a letter to the editor that recently appeared in one of our local newspapers, the Johnstown Tribune-Democrat, that the 1-104th is "under attack." In fact, Major General Craig's letter encapsulates this issue so well that I would like to read it into the RECORD now.

Major General Craig writes:

Johnstown battalion is under attack.

The more than 250 members of the Pennsylvania Army National Guard's 1-104th Attack Reconnaissance Battalion, based in Johnstown, may lose their Apache helicopters and a number of them could be furloughed if the Army has its way.

These are the same highly trained soldiers who recently returned from a year-long deployment in Afghanistan, where they provided aerial support using AH-64 Apache helicopters fighting side-by-side with their active component counterparts.

The Army wants to restructure its aviation fleet by divesting itself from Kiowa helicopters and replacing them with Apache helicopters taken from the Army National Guard.

Consequently, the removal of 24 Apaches from our inventory in Johnstown will render the 1-104th a nonmission-capable force when it comes to defending our Nation at home and abroad.

In turn, the Army proposes to replace the Apaches with only 12 other aircraft—a 50 percent reduction in the number of aircraft that we have in Johnstown.

Detrimental actions like this prove that the National Guard is still considered "second-rate" by the Active component despite us demonstrating our competence and effectiveness over the last 11 years of war.

Taking away highly trained personnel and equipment from the Reserve component—which cost a fraction of what it does in the Active component to operate—does not make sense for our community, Commonwealth or country.

Major General Craig concludes:

Having worn the uniform for more than 40 years, I, too, have been trained to fight; and fight I will for the skilled and courageous troops of our Nation's reserve forces.

Signed, Major General Wesley E. Craig, Adjutant General, Pennsylvania National Guard.

Mr. Speaker, there are better options than this. Let us commit to working together to ensure that the National Guard units like the 1-104th continue to receive the support they have earned and deserve.

Mr. PERRY. I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

At this time, we are going to talk a little bit about aviation, and Guard

aviation in particular, because it is something I have been familiar with since the mid-1980s, when I first went to flight school. It is one of the issues that has become the forefront of this discussion and this argument.

Mr. ROTHFUS noted the drawdown and the cuts to Guard aviation and the claim, or the charge, that the Guard is not trained, accessible, or ready. With that, I just harken back to my short time in Iraq when I served with some of the finest aviators on the planet from Alpha 106 from Indiana, a group of fine people under my command in the task that had been to Iraq, many of them, before. They told me the stories of their time there before.

They were just above reproach, and they were the most professional and well-trained individuals that were competent to do the mission from the day they showed up on the ground; and they proved that every single day for a year.

With that, I yield to my friend from the great State of Illinois, who also served with those fine individuals from that very company and has sacrificed greatly for our Nation. She would like to discuss this issue as well.

Congresswoman DUCKWORTH.

Ms. DUCKWORTH. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, 10 years ago, my National Guard aviation battalion was deployed to Operation Iraqi Freedom. We performed missions ranging from forward refueling point operations to air assaults all across the battlefield in Iraq. We were so effective that the multinational forces headquarters assigned us to help Active Duty aviation units to fly their missions as well as our own. Yet when we first reported to coordinate these missions, our Active Duty counterparts welcomed us literally by dismissively saying, Well, here comes the JV team.

Despite this less than friendly welcome, my Guard unit seamlessly integrated and carried out not only our own, but also their Active flight missions as well. In the process, we gained trust and mutual appreciation and respect.

We have come so far as a Nation and as a military. For 12 years, our Guard and Reserve units have fought side-by-side with our Active Duty counterparts in combat zones all over the world. This Nation spent precious blood, sweat, and treasure to build a fully interchangeable, cost-effective operational reserve that has been key to our successes in defending our Nation against all enemies, foreign and domestic. To squander this investment and divest our training and equipping of the reserve forces is a huge disservice to our taxpayers and to our national security.

The Guardsman is "twice the citizen," relied on heavily by our Governors and generals alike. They respond whether the duty station is a mountain pass in Afghanistan or the flooding banks of the Mississippi River.

The Guardsman is one-third the cost of an Active Duty soldier or airman. The Guardsman is the least expensive asset our military has and a critical and complementary component of our overall force structure.

We are a better Nation with a better military than to dismantle the sacrifices made on the battlefield with false claims of National Guard and Reserves' lack of capability. For 22 years I have served in the Reserves and in the Guard, the last 8 years of which were without pay.

I certainly have devoted much more than 39 days a year to serving my Nation as a military pilot; and so have my fellow Guard troops, whose sacrifices and capabilities are often underrepresented and under appreciated.

I urge my colleagues to join me in helping preserve the operational capability of the Guard in this year's National Defense Authorization Act.

Mr. PERRY. Thank you.

At this time I would also like to yield to my colleague from Mississippi (Mr. PALAZZO), for a few comments.

Mr. PALAZZO. I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania, as he is being called today, Colonel PERRY, for yielding to me.

Mr. Speaker, the recent comments by Army leadership are as ridiculous as anything I have seen in quite some time. In a transparent effort to protect their own, they have effectively thrown the men and women of the National Guard out with the bath water.

It is a fact that the average National Guardsman costs one-third of what his Active Duty counterpart does.

□ 1245

Now, I ask the American people, what is the better investment here?

Giving these brave citizens soldiers a pink slip is not only ridiculous from a readiness standpoint, but it amounts to throwing away billions of dollars and hours of training.

Here is your pink slip. Thanks for all your hard work, but we won't be needing you anymore is basically what they are saying.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that the men and women of our National Guard are not only the smarter financial decision, but they have also earned their stripes over the past 12 years at war.

As a current member of the Mississippi National Guard, I know that the men and women I serve with and those who come from all over the United States and the territories to train at Camp Shelby before deployment are some of the most professional and most capable soldiers and airmen that our Nation has ever produced, regardless of what General Odierno has said. These men and women are the best-trained, most battle-hardened force that the Guard has seen in their 377-year history. These men and women have fought side by side for over 12 years with the men and women of our Active Duty. To put them back on the shelf will not only waste that experi-

ence, but it does nothing to deal with what many military leaders have said is the biggest threat to our national security, and that is our national debt.

Meanwhile, some Members of this body are content to watch our national debt climb on the back of runaway entitlement spending that continues to suck away resources from every sector. We are cutting right to the bone from our best capabilities. I honestly have trouble believing that Army leadership truly thinks the best way to handle budget pressures is to gut our military capability, but that is exactly what they are doing.

Mr. Speaker, I promise that if the Army and the President bring this half-baked idea to us here in Congress, I will do everything, along with my colleagues, in my power as a Member of this House and as a member of the House Armed Services Committee to ensure that it is soundly defeated.

Congressman, thank you very much for putting on this Special Order.

Mr. PERRY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Mississippi for his comments.

Again, we are not saying that the Guard and the Reserve aren't willing to do their part. It is my belief, it is this Member's belief, that the DOD and the Chiefs are under significant pressure from the administration to do what they are doing.

We are asking for an open process and to be involved in the conversation because we want to do our part. But we can't watch the investments that have been mentioned here today be eviscerated, be thrown away, be cast away like so many things.

We understand very clearly over the course of this last 5 years this administration's tenor and attitude towards our Nation's fighting forces, but we must continue on for the sake of what we have invested in and the sacrifices that have been made by members of our hometowns in the Guard and Reserve.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the fine gentleman from Illinois (Mr. ENYART).

Mr. ENYART. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. PERRY and I might debate about the causes for the budget cuts at the Pentagon and for the reasons for the budget cuts there, but what we do not debate and what we stand shoulder to shoulder on is the fact that the Army National Guard, the Air National Guard, is the best-trained, best-equipped, best-led National Guard force that we have ever had in our history.

I had the honor, before I came to Congress, of serving as the Adjutant General, commanding the 13,000 Army and Air National Guardsmen of the great State of Illinois.

Unfortunately what has happened, as the drawdown has started to occur, the Pentagon has put forth a plan that would slash the Army National Guard. The Army National Guard and, for that matter, the Air National Guard—today we are specifically talking about the Army, but every remark I make applies to the Air National Guard as well.

The Army National Guard serves as America's insurance policy. It serves as the shock absorber for our military. We can't maintain a large enough military to answer every contingency, and that is why we have the Army National Guard and that is why we have the Army Reserve. Those are the soldiers that we call forth when we need them. When we don't need them, they train at home.

In 2005, in Iraq, 51 percent of the soldiers in Iraq were Army National Guardsmen and Reservists—51 percent. Over half were Army National Guard and Reserves. Yet today, folks in the Pentagon want to slash the Army National Guard.

We had a blizzard in Illinois last week. That blizzard was so bad that Interstate 57 at its juncture with Interstate 70 in Effingham, Illinois was closed. There were six jackknifed semitrucks. There were 375 cars stacked up, couldn't get through, snow blowing, 35-below windchill factor. That blizzard was so bad that the wreckers couldn't get through. That blizzard was so bad that the snowplows, the Illinois Department of Transportation could not get through.

Who got through? What did the Governor do? The Governor called out the Illinois National Guard. He called out those battlefield wreckers that serve the purpose in battle of going forth on the battlefield and pulling the Humvees and other Army vehicles that are damaged and inoperable off the battlefield. Those eight wheel-drive vehicles could get through that blizzard. They could get through those snowdrifts. They rescued those hundreds of stranded people in those 375 cars and six semitrucks on Interstate 57.

Now, that equipment, that is wartime equipment. And you know what the folks over at the Pentagon are arguing today? Well, they are going to strip every single AH-64 attack helicopter out of the Army National Guard, saying, well, the Governors don't need them. What do you need an attack helicopter in the Illinois National Guard or the Pennsylvania National Guard or any other National Guard for?

And, by the way, Illinois doesn't have AH-64s, so I don't have a dog in this fight other than supporting the National Guard.

The Pentagon is saying you don't need them.

What is the first maxim you learn in the Army? You train as you fight. You have to train as you fight so you know what you are doing when you go into battle. That is why the Army National Guard needs those attack helicopters, so they can go into battle with them. They will train with them so that they can fight with them.

Based on the Army's logic, the Illinois National Guard wouldn't have had those battlefield wreckers to go in and rescue those people.

We can't let this happen to the National Guard.

I went to the retirement ceremony for Lieutenant General Bill Ingram this week over at Fort Myer, and General Ingram was the TAG of North Carolina. We served together as TAGs. He commanded North Carolina; I had Illinois. He got promoted to Lieutenant General; I got demoted to Congress.

But at his retirement ceremony, he got up and spoke. And what was the first unit that the Army called up out of North Carolina in 2001 when we were ready to go to war? It was the attack helicopters. It was the AH-64s. They were the shock absorber. They were the insurance policy for America.

While we are talking about the Pentagon, when you look at the Pentagon today, you look at the Active Duty military establishment. We have more generals and admirals today than we had during World War II. We have an army of less than 500,000 people. In World War II, it was about 5 million. It was about 10 times the size. But today we have more generals, and every one of those generals on Active Duty Has a staff, and they have cooks and drivers and so on and so forth. Right now they have 250 one- or two-star generals serving on Active Duty in the Army.

Now, a division, you need to understand, is commanded by a two-star general.

Does anybody in here besides Representative PERRY and Representative DUCKWORTH know how many Active Duty divisions we have in the United States Army?

We have 10. That is 10 two-star generals. We have 250 on Active Duty.

I think before we start cutting those soldiers who go out onto that battlefield of a blizzard, operating that battlefield wrecker, pulling people and saving lives, doing that double duty, doing that double duty of saving lives in floods, blizzards, and hurricanes, as well as deploying to Afghanistan, I think maybe we need to look at cutting some of the fat, some of that excess, some of those excess two-stars.

That is what we need to do. We need to preserve our insurance policy. We need to preserve that best-trained, best-equipped and best-led National Guard force that has fought for us, not only in Afghanistan, not only in Iraq, but also on the home front.

And one last pitch for the Illinois National Guard. We have had Illinois National Guard soldiers on duty 24 hours a day, 365 days a year in the battle, first in Iraq, and then in Afghanistan, every day since we went into Iraq—every single day, National Guard soldiers. So to those folks over in the Pentagon who think that National Guard soldiers are second-class soldiers, I have got a few brave people I would like you to meet, and one of them is sitting right there, Lieutenant Colonel TAMMY DUCKWORTH.

Thank you very much, Mr. PERRY.

Mr. PERRY. Mr. Speaker, I thank Mr. ENYART for his service to our Nation, both in the military forces as well as here in Congress. I would like to just

reflect upon his remarks as well. It is my intent to bring a different standard of decorum and bearing to the discussion.

Again, we understand that DOD is under significant pressure and fighting for its life. We would like a place at the table to have a discussion, because we don't think that a proportional cut—if you are cutting 100 percent, and you say 50 percent to the active component and 50 percent to the reserve component is the same thing, it is not the same thing if the reserve component costs one-third, yet you yield the same results when you have those servicemembers on the battlefield.

We are going to continue the discussion, but at this time I would like to yield to my friend, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOHIO).

Mr. YOHIO. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank my colleague, my friend, Congressman PERRY, from the great State of Pennsylvania, for organizing this Special Order to talk about the importance of the National Guard to our great Nation.

The Third District of Florida is home to the Camp Blanding Joint Training Center and to over 2,000 National Guardsmen and -women and their families. And we in the Third District of Florida, as well as the State of Florida, are extremely proud of the National Guard and of their service in the past, and especially in the recent years in the wars in the Middle East. They answered the call and performed admirably.

The National Guard is a cost-effective force that is integral to the effectiveness of the United States military. Over the past 12 years, Congress has invested billions of dollars to train and equip the National Guard as an operational reserve. It would be a disservice to the taxpayers and to national security to squander this investment away.

They are that well-regulated militia, the minutemen of our Nation, which is necessary in order to have a free and secure Nation. They are ready, when called upon, to aid our Nation in times of need. Be it for national security or for national disaster, they answer the call.

We must ensure that their effectiveness and readiness is not adversely affected by a lack of our foresight. We are proud of all of our Guardsmen and -women, and we must not forget the great sacrifices that they have made in defense of our Nation.

Again, I want to thank my colleague, Mr. PERRY, for arranging this Special Order. Thank you for your service, too.

Mr. PERRY. Thank you, Mr. YOHIO.

And to continue the conversation, I would like to yield to the gentlewoman from the great State of Arizona (Ms. SINEMA).

Ms. SINEMA. Thank you to the gentleman from Pennsylvania for hosting that bipartisan Special Order.

Unfortunately, these days in Washington there are too few issues that bring Republicans and Democrats together to find reasonable solutions to

the challenges facing our country, but supporting the National Guard is one issue that certainly brings us together, which is why I appreciate the opportunity to join my colleagues today.

The United States needs a fully functional and operational National Guard. The active military and the National Guard may have different attributes, but they train and certify to the same standards, and Guard units and personnel can function interchangeably with their Active Duty brothers and sisters.

We rely on the National Guard to protect our country overseas and here at home. Arizona has a proud tradition of service, and we are proud of our fellow Arizonans who become citizen soldiers.

Since September 11, over 12,000 members of the Arizona National Guard have deployed, and we have 150 members currently mobilized.

Not only does the Arizona National Guard deploy overseas, it has a critical mission here at home: responding to natural disasters, improving border security, and performing counterdrug operations.

The Arizona National Guard is also leading the way in helping our citizen soldiers and their families balance the challenges of service with civilian life.

Under the leadership of Lieutenant Colonel Denise Sweeney, Director of Arizona's National Guard Total Force Team, the Be Resilient Program is promoting mission readiness and retention by increasing the resilience of each servicemember and their family.

□ 1300

The Total Force Team focuses on integrating and coordinating the efforts of all resilience and support programs for Arizona National Guard members and their families, and it leverages public-private partnership to engage the broader community.

This program is strengthening servicemembers and their families and is another example of why the Arizona National Guard is so important to our State and why the National Guard deserves our full support.

I support a defense budget that responsibly uses taxpayer dollars and keeps our country safe and secure. I have serious concerns that the proposed cuts to our National and Reserve component would undermine the ability of Arizona's National Guard to perform its critical missions.

Substantially reducing the size of National Guard, and in particular, removing all helicopter attack aviation, could hurt Arizona and our national security. You can't build emergency response, combat, and leadership capabilities overnight. We will continue to call on our National Guard in times of need. We should make sure they have all the training, tools, and force strength to answer that call.

As a member of a military family, I understand that these citizen soldiers and their families make great sac-

rifices in order to serve our country. We should stand up and support these brave and committed men and women, and give them the tools that they need to keep us safe.

Thank you, Colonel PERRY, for hosting this time. I look forward to working with my colleagues on this important issue more.

Mr. PERRY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlelady from Arizona and would also like to commend her on her comments regarding the Guard.

Specifically, for me as an Army aviator, one of the main topics of discussion in the reduction of forces in the Guard is Army-Guard aviation. The comments that, quite frankly, that are disappointing and hit my heart are that Guardsmen train 39 days a year, and that is 2 days a month and 15 days a year of annual training. I would suggest to you that I know very few—as a matter of fact, I don't know one single Guard member that trains only 39 days a year.

As a commissioned officer who was on flight status, I spent the bulk of my time during the 2 days a month, and 15 days in the year, commanding, doing administrative things, leading my troops, planning for the future, planning their training.

The other time that I came in at least once a week, if not more often, was to get my flight time because I had the exact same requirements. It is important to note when folks say, well, they are not as trained, they are not accessible, and not ready as Active components, it is not to take anything away from the Active component, because they train every single day.

I will tell you this: I have the same standards, require the same amount of flight hours, the same check rides, flight evaluations, the same physical requirements every single year as an Active Duty aviator. If I am a gun pilot, I must do gunnery. If I am a utility pilot, I must do sling loads, I must fly with night-vision goggles so that I am ready to go. Indeed, we are ready to go every single time.

People say, well, why do we need attack assets? Why do we need the AH-64 Apache in the Guard? I am not sure, quite honestly, from the standpoint of are you protecting your State that we need that AH-64 Apache in the Guard, but I will tell this: most Guard units are replete with former members of the Active component. They did their time on Active Duty, whether it was 6 years, or whether it was 15 or 18, and then they came to the Guard, and they enhanced their skills.

As a matter of fact, on Active Duty when you are downrange, when you are over the wire, and you are serving with Active Duty members and Guard and Reservists, oftentimes if given a choice to fly with members of the Guard as opposed to Active Duty, many Active Duty components will choose to fly with the Guard members.

There is one simple reason. It is because the Active Duty component, even

though they are serving all day long, every day of the year, as a captain you are administering your administrative duties. You are leading your troops. You are planning their training, but you are not flying. So the bulk of the experience in doing the job of flying the aircraft is actually in the Guard. If you have a choice between flying with a captain and a lieutenant who have 800 hours between them or flying with a Guard CW-4 and a captain that have 35 to 4,000 hours between them in difficult terrain, in difficult conditions, what would you choose?

The mechanics who work on these aircraft don't work on them just a little bit and then move on to something else. They work on these aircraft for 20, 30 years at a stretch. They know every single thing about them; they live with them, they sleep with them. Oh, by the way, many of these folks are active Guard and Reserves. So it is not just 39 days a year, and not only more than that, it is every single day of the year. That is why the Guard and the Reserves are ready to go when called upon, and people will say, well, you are not ready to go. You have got to go to a MOB site and train before you can go.

As a task force commander, a battalion commander who went through that, I was ready to go. I met my minimums, and I met every single requirement that the Active component met. So did all of the members of my unit, men and women who had served for years and years. When they send you to a place like that they give you a unit from Illinois, they give you a unit from Alaska, or a unit from Oregon, a unit on Active Duty, a unit from the Reserves. You haven't worked together. You have got to spend a little time figuring out your SOPs, your standard operating procedures, so that you can work together, and that does take some time.

I would also say that sometimes the Guard and Reserve, things are placed upon them for training purposes that the Active component says we need, when we would argue we don't need, and they slow us down from getting to the fight.

As an aviator, I wondered why I had to get into the heat trainer. I had to do rollover drills in a Humvee. I am not driving a Humvee around the streets of Iraq or Afghanistan. I am flying an aircraft, and that is where I should spend my time, but the Active component says, no, you all are going to do this and it takes some time. We get that. They want us to be safe and they want us to have that training. Okay, we get it.

Our core mission, the things that we do, the things we train for, the things the taxpayers pay for is exactly the same for an Army aviator in the Guard as an Army aviator serving on Active Duty. Now, it might not be the same for artillery men or an infantryman or a medic or something like that, it might not be. I don't know because I don't serve in those branches, but I know my branch.

I would say that each of us have our strengths and we recognize that. We recognize the Active component strength. I think in my heart that the Active component, DOD recognizes the strength of the Guard, but again, it would be my contention that DOD is fighting for its life, not against its brethren who have served in an Army of one, but against an administration who arguably doesn't have the same view as many of those who serve and many Americans that support the armed services of the armed services. So they are in a difficult position.

I think about when they say that we are not ready to go, the Eastern Army Aviation Training Site, located at Fort Indiantown Gap where I serve, the folks that serve there work every single day, and they train Army aviators. That is what they do there. When you leave Fort Rucker and need to get an advanced aircraft, you come to EAATS many times—Eastern Army Aviation Training Site—and learn to fly a Chinook, learn to fly a Black Hawk. They don't do that in Fort Rucker in many cases. Your advanced training happens in the Guard. That is where that experience is.

Not only is it the same aircraft that many times the Active component is flying, but the EAATS folks oftentimes train even more advanced aircraft than the Active component's flying. I think that those EAATS guys are out training the special operations guys in the F model Chinook. These are Guard folks, training the Active component to go do their mission, and not just any Active component, special operations, the best of the best. Guard folks are training them. I don't want anybody to lose sight of that argument and that discussion.

You know, I am not saying, again, that the Guard shouldn't do its part. We are ready to do our part. We understand that the budget is tight and that changes must be made. But we are asking again for an open and a transparent conversation that meets the standards of decorum and bearing that we have so come to love, and one of the reasons why many people serve in our Armed Forces. I want to be an army of one that doesn't fight with his brothers and sisters in the Active component.

As a task force commander, I was privileged—and I mean well privileged—to command a task force of 800 to 1,000 souls that included National Guard, Active component, Reserves from the continental United States, from places in Europe, all fine individuals working under one commander, one mission, with one standard. I am concerned when I hear that the chiefs are being put into, in my opinion, a position to say that the Guard and the Reserves are lesser, because it is my experience that they are not.

It is my experience when soldiers are serving side by side that they don't see, and they don't recognize, and they don't notice any difference. They do their jobs. I don't want the chiefs to be

put in that position. So we are asking, we are pleading, through this, with the administration. Let's have an open process. Let's have one that is transparent. Let's have one that we can engage in a conversation, because if the Guard costs 30 percent of what the Active Duty costs are, then a proportional cut really isn't proportional. If we offer things that are important to the Nation, as is evidenced in the last 10 or 15 years of war by our presence, where 50 percent of the component is fighting those wars, not only in just logistics, but in kinetic activity, engaging the enemy in close combat, with the tools of the trade, with what you have offered and have sacrificed greatly, greatly, your Guard and Reserve, those men and women, they go, and some of them don't come home. Their sacrifice is just as important as those in the Active component.

It would be my contention, Mr. Speaker, that we need to slow this process down. It needs to be opened up so that everybody can see, and so that everything can be evaluated and that the Guard and Reserve can do its part but shouldn't have to do more than its part.

The Nation's investment in this readiness that you find in your States that comes into play when you have storms, when you have natural disasters, comes to play right there; that that readiness isn't lost, and that the days of the strategic Reserve are long in the past and that we don't go back to that failed model, and that we don't draw down so significantly that when we have a new administration, the American taxpayer will be asked, well, we are not ready to fight. We are not ready to meet our constitutional obligation to defend this Nation. Now we must spend more money to get back to where we were. We don't have to do that.

This administration's actions right now, we are making a conscious choice to reduce our readiness without cause, without reason, without justification, without a conversation. So, while some will say that it is too expensive, we have an obligation. It is expensive. Training and equipment is expensive. There is a great deal to be had in the Guard and Reserve. Again, I would like to have a discussion that honors the decorum and bearing that all service-members are bound to.

Mr. Speaker, in closing, I appreciate the time that the Nation has taken to listen to this argument. I would ask that you call, that you write, that you email, that you correspond with your Representatives in this House of Representatives, and in the Senate, and with this administration to talk to them about having an open process by which we have to make changes to our fighting forces and to the defense of this Nation.

Well, let's have it open, let's have an open process, let's have a candid discussion, let's not pit one brother, one sister against another in this fight. We

are all on the same team. Let's not do that. Let's have an open conversation and let's make the best arrangement we can that serves both the Guard, both the Reserve, both the Active forces, and in particular, the necessary defense of this Nation.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. PERRY. With that, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the subject of this Special Order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BYRNE). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. PERRY. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Speaker, I am opposed to draconian budget cuts that would adversely impact the Army National Guard.

Currently, my State of West Virginia is under a State of Emergency because of a chemical spill into our Capital's water supply. Our state's National Guard has been critical in getting clean drinking water to affected residents and ensuring their health and safety.

The Guard's assistance is an absolute necessity in times of state emergencies, but let us not forget that the men and women of the Guard are also serving overseas and safeguarding our Nation's security as Soldiers in the Total Army, held to the same standards and exposed to the same risks as their active component counterparts.

I strongly believe that a proposal to reduce the Army National Guard to its lowest level in over 50 years would not only weaken our national security and homeland defenses, but makes very little fiscal sense within a long-term military strategy, as personnel costs for Guardsmen are roughly one-third the cost of active component personnel.

Congress should be clear from the beginning of the budget cycle that draconian, end strength reductions to the Reserve Component are dangerous. We owe our Guard and the American people better.

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I rise to voice my concern about the proposed size of our Army. Our active Army should not be reduced to 420,000 personnel and our National Guard to 315,000 personnel as this represents a substantial risk to our national security policy. Within the Army, I am concerned about the restructuring of the Army Aviation force. This restructuring would represent a significant policy shift away from the Army's, "Total Force Policy." It would also negatively impact Army National Guard aviation and the communities in which those units are based.

I fully understand that sequestration has caused the Army to make some very difficult decisions about their future force structure. I do not want to see a repeat of the 1990s when the active and reserve components fought one another for the limited resources available. However, that seems to be the path we are on and it in no way advances our national security. That is why, I begin by asking and imploring my colleagues in the House of Representatives to work together to find a solution to sequestration and repeal this misguided method of reducing spending. It is our



Constitutional duty to provide for the common defense and we should not be reducing spending by placing half of the cuts on the back of the Department of Defense when defense spending only represents 15.1 percent of the budget.

Following the Vietnam War, former Chief of Staff of the Army, General Creighton Abrams devised the Total Force Policy. This policy vested much of the Army's reserve combat power in the hands of the Army National Guard. The Army National Guard was meant to be a "mirror image," of the active force to the extent possible and to provide strategic depth in times of conflict. Mirror imaging meant that the National Guard would be trained and fielded with the same equipment as the active Army and this proposed aviation restructuring veers away from the total force policy.

There are those that say that Army National Guard aviation currently is not a mirror image of the active force because the structure of units is different. Providing a mirror image of brigade structure is not the point, the National Guard is not resourced or intended to follow the active duty Combat Aviation Brigade (CAB) structure. The mirror imaging is in smaller units such as battalions that permit the Army to have strategic depth in its forces so that in wartime, the active units do not have to bear the full brunt of the fight. Without the National Guard and strategic depth, these past 12 years of conflict in Afghanistan and Iraq would have broken our Army.

Divesting the Army National Guard of the Apache helicopter is a mistake. The active Army will have all of its attack and scout aviation power in the active force with no strategic depth and no reserve relief available if we find ourselves engaged in another major conflict. Enormous amounts of training dollars will be wasted. Years of aviation and combat experience will have been squandered.

Our National Guard Apache pilots are amongst the finest in the world. In my home state of South Carolina, the 1st of the 151st (1-151) attack reconnaissance battalion is one of the best attack battalions in the Army. There operational tempo is not as high as the active Army and it gives them a chance to train on critical skills that active duty simply does not have time for with the fight ongoing in Afghanistan. The 1-151st recently began to train its pilots on how to land an Apache on a Navy ship. Prior to these pilots becoming qualified, the Army did not have one single Apache pilot currently qualified to perform deck landings. Now however, the pilots of the 1-151 are helping to train the rest of the Army on this difficult and important task.

In closing, the battle we have is with sequestration. The active and reserve components should not be fighting one another; we in Congress should be providing them the necessary resources they require. We need to resource the Army at a level that protects our national security and keeps our personnel levels at the necessary levels, and keeps our equipment in the reserve and active components modernized and ready.

□ 1315

#### FIRST CONSTITUTIONAL DUTY: PROVIDE FOR OUR COMMON DEFENSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of Jan-

uary 3, 2013, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT) for 30 minutes.

Mr. GOHMERT. I appreciate so much my dear friend, Mr. PERRY's, last hour, almost, talking about such an important issue. I know there are those who say the number one job of Congress is to create jobs; but I think a more appropriate reading of our constitutional duties is, number one, we are supposed to provide for the common defense. Every American should do as George Washington prayed that we would, to never forget those who have served in the field—that is our military men and women—some of whom have given all, but all gave something.

That was Washington's prayer at the end of his resignation as he resigned as the commander of the Revolutionary forces—something that had never been done before. And my understanding is it has not happened since. As a leader in the Maldives Islands said a few years ago, unsolicited, he said:

We have never had a George Washington to set the proper example, so we are always worried about a military coup.

And, unfortunately, they have had one.

What a blessed Nation we are because people like Washington were raised up for such a time as they were in. Abraham Lincoln spoke more than once so eloquently about the need to help those who have served and their widows and orphans. So it is particularly dismaying when Congress passes anything that does not properly honor and address the issues of those who have served in the field, and as we have talked about before, to follow up and fulfill our obligation to keep our promises. This government promises individuals if you come into the military and you serve until retirement, here is what you will get in return. We should not break our promises to those who have served and risked life and limb to protect us.

Just as my friend, Marcus Latrel, said recently on CNN, basically that they didn't go to the mission in Afghanistan senselessly, that it is not senseless when someone hears the call, sees the order of his country, and acts in accordance with their order, win, lose or draw. And that is the mentality. Of my 4 years in the Army, probably 2½ were under Commander Jimmy Carter and a year and a half under Commander in Chief Ronald Reagan. The last year and a half was far better because we had a Commander in Chief that truly appreciated more the opinion of those who were serving in the field and restored honor for the military. President Carter, obviously, from his background had respect, but you sure couldn't tell it from the actions when we were in the military. As a result, our reputation suffered around the world and we had an act of war on our embassy in Tehran. And other than a scaled-back rescue attempt—scaled back by the White House itself—we were embarrassed.

And it is still used for recruiting today among radical extremists. Muslim Brotherhood members abroad say that these guys don't have the backbone to do what is necessary to win.

In such an important time in this world where so much is at risk to have an administration and some in the House or Senate that think it is okay to break our word to our military. We have got to turn this around. To those who think it is okay, we need to make clear, Mr. Speaker, it is not okay. We have the moral obligation to keep our promises and to do everything we can to protect those who are protecting us and to never send them into harm's way unless they have been given authority to win.

That should have been the lesson learned from Vietnam that wasn't learned. The lesson was not that we couldn't win—we could. And as SAM JOHNSON says in his book and points out in person after his 7 years in the Hanoi Hilton—much of it in complete isolation, brutally treated—after carpet bombing North Vietnam for 2 weeks, which could have happened many years before and ended the war early, a vindictive commander at the Hanoi Hilton laughed, saying, in effect, you stupid Americans, if you had just bombed us for 1 more week, we would have had to surrender unconditionally.

So it should be. We should not get involved anywhere where we do not give full authority to those in our military to go kick rear-ends, win, and then come home.

In an article today by Kristina Wong from "The Hill" publication, headline "Pentagon's hands tied on hunting down Benghazi attackers," this article says:

The U.S. military cannot hunt down and kill people responsible for the deadly 2012 attack on an American compound in Benghazi, Libya, as long as the terrorists are not officially deemed members or affiliates of al Qaeda, newly declassified transcripts from congressional hearings show.

This article goes on to say:

"In other words, they don't fall under the AUMF, that stands for authorized use of military force, authorized by the Congress of the United States. So we would not have the capacity to simply find them and kill them either with a remotely piloted aircraft or with an assault on the ground," Dempsey said.

They are talking about General Dempsey in his testimony before the House Armed Services Committee, and those were the transcripts that were released.

But he is the chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and here is where I have become amazed how this administration could think that the AUMF somehow gives this President authority without consulting Congress to go over and bomb and have our military play an active role in taking out Qadhafi, provide weapons to Libyans who very well may have been used to help attack our consulate, by the way, in Benghazi. We don't know enough to know for sure, but there is a good chance we

were giving them the weapons. But how this President, this administration, thinks you can go over and go to war against Qadhafi, who had become an ally after he got scared enough after the invasion of Iraq that he just opened up all of his weapons systems, became an ally and, as some moderate Muslim leaders in the Middle East have said to me, he wasn't a good guy, but he was one of your good friends after he got scared of you in 2003. And some have said he was doing more to help fight terrorism in that part of the world than anybody besides Israel, and yet you bomb him and you give weapons to go against him. We don't understand you.

But this administration felt as if under the AUMF it had full authority to go in and attack a place where even the Secretary of Defense said we have no national security interest in Libya. Oh, sure, the Organization of Islamic Council, the 57 states that make up that organization—sometimes confused with the 50 States we have here in America—but that 57 states that make up the OIC, they wanted us to go in and take out Qadhafi because they didn't like him because he was fighting terrorism, radical Islam, and the Muslim Brotherhood.

How would an administration, how would a Commander in Chief have authority to go into Libya, and then when we find out there are people that still want to destroy America, kill Americans and destroy our way of life, all of a sudden you say, but we don't really have authority to go after people who have declared war on us, have committed an act of war in attacking our embassy, but we are just not sure we can go after them.

That did not seem to stop this administration and the President from issuing an order to murder, to kill a guy I wasn't a fan of, Anwar al-Awlaki, a U.S. citizen because his parents came over on a visa and he was born here, and then he went back and was taught to hate America. Even though earlier, even during the Bush administration, he came to Capitol Hill and led congressional Muslim staffers here in prayer here on Capitol Hill; even though he had contacts within this administration, he visited with people in this administration's government, for some reason, we didn't see the need to arrest him and put him on trial here in America, but they thought it would be better just to hit him with a drone attack in Yemen and kill him over there.

And I'm not finding fault necessarily. That is a different debate over whether a President should order a drone attack on an American citizen without a trial. My point is if this administration felt as if the AUMF, the authorization for use of military force, allowed him to take out an American citizen in Yemen, then how is it that this administration all of a sudden gets scared and says, gee, we might violate the AUMF if we go after the people that killed our Ambassador in an act of war

against U.S. property, which was our consulate in Benghazi?

I think it is helpful to read directly from the language. It is something I was extremely concerned about and a number of my friends here have been extremely concerned about. It is why we have pushed amendments to rein in the Presidential authority to go after American citizens, and we have worked on language and passed language to effect this to prevent any U.S. President, whether it was former President Bush while he was still President or this President or a future President, it would prevent them from being able to just arrest an American citizen and hold them indefinitely. We put restraints on the President.

Here is the language that now-General Dempsey and this administration say we just don't really have the authority under the AUMF to go after the guys that assassinated our Ambassador and killed three others including two former Navy SEALs and took much of the leg of a former Army Ranger that was on the rooftop with Ty Woods and Glen Doherty.

Here is the language. It says:

That the President is authorized to use all necessary and appropriate force against those nations, organizations, or persons he determines planned, authorized, committed or aided the terrorist attacks that occurred on September 11, 2001, or harbored such organizations or persons, in order to prevent any future acts of international terrorism against the United States by such nations, organizations or persons.

So we have had people that took that and said, gee, you know, al-Awlaki didn't help plan 2001's 9/11 attack. In fact, we had him around Washington, leading prayers here on Capitol Hill and having contacts with this administration. But, gee, they didn't have a problem using this language to kill an American citizen in Yemen—not because he participated or helped plan 9/11/2001, but simply because they were using language here in the last part that:

Or harbored such organizations or persons, in order to prevent future acts of international terrorism against the United States by such nations.

So that has been interpreted by this administration for a long time now, gee, you didn't have to participate or help plan 9/11/2001; but if you did anything to aid, abet, assist, encourage in any way any of these organizations that may have participated in some way in 9/11/2001, then the President can do whatever he needs to with military force to, as it says:

Prevent any future acts of international terrorism against the United States by such nations, organizations or persons.

□ 1330

Well, if al-Awlaki could have this language used to take him out with a drone attack, then certainly under this administration's definition and usage of that language, it sure ought to authorize them to go after people that declared war on us and committed an act

of war against our enemy, or harbored such persons or organizations. And we already know, everybody but The New York Times, everybody knows that the organizations, some of the organizations that participated in the 9/11/12 attack, the act of war on our consulate in Benghazi, were affiliated with al Qaeda, organizations that did participate in 9/11.

So these organizations didn't necessarily part in 9/11 on 2001, but they certainly were working with them. So anyway, it just seems to be contradictory for the administration to use the AUMF to possibly accede their authority to kill people abroad and then turn around and hide behind it.

And perhaps if Dr. Gates had not written the book he did and given us insight into things that are said or not said in this administration, then maybe we wouldn't know as much. But since we now know that even the Secretary of Defense and our top generals can feel the President is doing the wrong thing but not have the guts to tell him to his face, then I don't know, perhaps possibly General Dempsey is in that category now. Maybe he is one of those who fits in the category of maybe knowing something is appropriate but, instead, popping those heels together, saluting, yes, sir, and never fulfilling their duty not just to follow orders, but to give helpful information to a commander above you, in this case the Commander in Chief.

This article says:

The U.S. could seek to capture the Benghazi attackers under the existing AUMF, but it would need to allow forces in Libya, or any other countries in which the attackers are hiding, to do so.

Well, isn't that interesting, because that is not what this President did to kill al-Awlaki, Anwar al-Awlaki. They just killed him. They didn't allow any Yemen force, or anybody else. They just took him out with one of our drones bombs. And now all of a sudden they want to hide behind this language and say, Oh, well, actually, we can't do that. So is that our excuse now for why, after a year and a half—and I feel sorry for the President because basically he wasn't going to rest until we got these guys. So, man, a year and a half is a long time not to rest.

This article says Dempsey's classified comments highlight the limits of the existing authority which was approved by Congress after the September 11, 2001, attacks and the difficulty of fighting a constantly evolving enemy that in al Qaeda has inspired independent terrorist groups to try to murder American forces and civilians. The AUMF gives the military authority to hunt and kill those responsible for the 2001 attacks, wherever they are, and has allowed President Obama to authorize hundreds of drone strikes in Pakistan, Yemen, Somalia, and Libya. It has also been used to authorize several Special Operations raids, such as the one that took out Osama bin Laden.

But, see, the article just accepts what the administration says. General Dempsey said apparently in his testimony, Oh, well, gee, apparently you can go after all these other people. Well, if you can go after them, you can use the same language to go after the perpetrators of 9/11. So what is the administration afraid of?

I keep wanting these questions asked, and I think we need a select committee to ask these questions. Why don't you just come forward, all those in the administration that have information, why do you keep polygraphing our intelligence agents who knew what went on in Libya and what was going on in Libya? Why do you keep polygraphing them to make sure that they are not talking to Congress or anybody else? Why don't you just let them tell Members of Congress so we have better information from which we can authorize other actions and appropriate money to help with those actions? Why don't you just come forward and tell us what was going on? Why don't you try for a change being the most transparent administration in history? It is a long way to go, but maybe it is time to start.

We are in a war; and as others have so appropriately said, apparently we have been in a war since 1979 when radical Islamists committed the act of war against American property. An embassy belongs to the country and the soil is considered to be the country that occupies that embassy. You commit an act against that, military act, hostile act, it is an act of war. So we have been at war since 1979. The trouble is until 9/11/01, most Americans didn't know we were in a war. Only one side knew we were in a war. That was borne out in 1983 when our marines, over 200 marines, were killed in Beirut by a bombing, a truck bombing that came in there.

So many acts of war, of violence, including the 1993 World Trade Center bombing, including the two embassies that were bombed under the Clinton administration, although perhaps some in the administration might be tempted to ask, as Secretary Clinton asked not that long ago, What difference at this point does it make how or why they were killed basically in those embassies. Well, it makes a difference because we can prevent them in the future if we know why they were killed and what went wrong in the present. But it is a mystery.

Why hide behind the same AUMF as an excuse not to have brought the assassins of our Ambassador to justice? And something I heard, I heard a former JAG officer talking on Fox News one night this week, obviously a smart man, but an ignorant man. You can be smart, but be ignorant. He was ignorant of the Constitution because he seemed to think that the Constitution requires you capture someone who has declared war on you, you have to give them all kinds of access and let them send manifestos around, you have

to give them all kinds of freedom; and that is simply not the case. Some people who mean well but are ignorant of the Constitution say everybody has to be treated exactly the same under the Constitution. Their constitutional rights mean this or that, not understanding that actually under the Constitution everybody is not entitled to the same court. They are entitled to due process, but constitutionally that means different things.

So in the Army, in the military—I say the Army because that is what I was in—but in the military, constitutional rights are different. So you don't have the right to freedom of assembly. I wanted to claim that many times. We were ordered to be out for a 5 a.m. forced 25-mile march. I wanted to claim, Sir, I have a right to freedom of assembly wherever and whenever I want, and I would just rather not assemble for this 25-mile forced march. Or the—and I can't remember now—two 5-mile runs, whatever we used to do, early in the morning before you even started the day. It would have been nice to say, No.

It would be nice to have freedom of speech so as a member of the military we could have said what we really thought about some of President Carter's orders, but he was Commander in Chief. And as it should be, you are not allowed when you are Active Duty military to publicly criticize your command chain. In order to have good order and discipline, that is the way it needs to be. But once you are not on Active Duty, you can say whatever you want. You should be able to say without worrying about a drone taking you out.

So constitutional rights are different when you are in the military. The Constitution also makes clear that Congress has the authority to set up the disciplinary procedures, the court systems, tribunals for the military. It makes clear that Congress has the authority to set up different courts for immigration purposes, entirely constitutional.

So I get amused when some people that are smart, but ignorant about the Constitution, start saying everybody in America has a constitutional right to be tried before a United States district court. Well, that is ridiculous. There is not a U.S. district court that is even established in the Constitution. That is completely up to Congress. This Congress has the authority to get rid of every district court in America, get rid of every Federal court of appeals in America and just set up a whole new system. We have the authority to do that.

As Professor David Guinn used to say, there is only one court established in the Constitution, all others owe their existence, their jurisdiction, their very being to Congress. As Bill Cosby used to say, his daddy told him and his little brother, I brought you into this world and I can take you out.

Well, Congress brought these courts into this world, and Congress can re-

move them. We have that authority. So nobody has a constitutional right to a U.S. district court. There is no constitutional creation of a U.S. district court. It is up to Congress.

So to have some former JAG officer go on TV and say, Oh, yeah, you have to give all of these rights. No, you don't. Under our Constitution, if you declare war against the United States, we have every right if we capture you to hold you until the cessation, the stopping, of the hostility, the war that you declared against us. And then once the war is over, we don't have to try you. Convince your buddy, we will let you send a letter to your buddy telling them stop the war so I can be released as a POW. We don't have to release them if they are part of a group that is at war with us. And then when the end of the hostilities comes and the war is over, then you don't even have to release everybody that was a POW. If somebody you believe has probable cause, that is a good standard, you believe that they have committed a war crime, then instead of just releasing them and sending them home, you can try them for a war crime.

But I understand that there are a lot of people in this administration that don't really understand that part of the Constitution. Perhaps they got a bad professor at the University of Chicago Law School or somewhere, and they don't really understand what the Constitution actually says or doesn't say. But you can hold people indefinitely, and the Supreme Court verified that. You may have to give them a writ of habeas corpus hearing, but you don't have to let them go or send manifestos. We owe an obligation to protect this country. We have authority to do it here in Congress; and, Mr. Speaker, that is what we should do.

With that, I yield back the balance of my time.

#### LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Ms. SLAUGHTER (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today on account of family illness.

#### BILL AND A JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Karen L. Haas, Clerk of the House, reported that on January 15, 2014, she presented to the President of the United States, for his approval, the following bill and joint resolution.

H.J. Res. 106. Making further continuing appropriations for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes.

H.R. 3527. To amend the Public Health Service Act to reauthorize the poison center national toll-free number, national media campaign, and grant program, and for other purposes.

#### ADJOURNMENT

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 44 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, January 17, 2014, at 1 p.m.

#### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

4506. A letter from the Counsel, Legal Division, Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection, transmitting the Bureau's final rule — Defining Larger Participants of the Student Loan Servicing Market [Docket No.: CFPB-2013-0005] (RIN: 3170-AA35) received January 13, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

4507. A letter from the Regulatory Specialist, LRA, Department of the Treasury, transmitting the Department's final rule — Community Reinvestment Act Regulations [Docket ID: OCC-2013-0024] (RIN: 1557-AD77) received January 9, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

4508. A letter from the General Counsel, Federal Housing Finance Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Information Sharing Among Federal Home Loan Banks (RIN: 2590-AA35) received December 2, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

4509. A letter from the Deputy Secretary, Securities and Exchange Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Removal of Certain References to Credit Ratings Under the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 [Release No.: 34-71194; File No. S7-15-11] (RIN: 3235-AL14) received January 7, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

4510. A letter from the Acting Deputy Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Magnuson-Stevens Act Provisions; Fisheries Off West Coast States; Biennial Specifications and Management Measures; Inseason Adjustments [Docket No.: 120814338-2711-02] (RIN: 0648-BD71) received January 7, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

4511. A letter from the Acting Deputy Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Magnuson-Stevens Act Provisions; Fisheries Off West Coast States; Pacific Coast Groundfish Fishery; Pacific Whiting and Non-Whiting Allocations; Pacific Whiting Seasons [Docket No.: 130114034-3422-02] (RIN: 0648-XD016) received January 13, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

4512. A letter from the Deputy Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; 2014 Commercial Summer Flounder Quota Adjustments [Docket No.: 121009528-2729-02] (RIN: 0648-XD026) received January 13, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

4513. A letter from the Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Caribbean, Gulf of Mexico, and South Atlantic; Revisions to Headboat Reporting Requirements for Species Managed by the South Atlantic Fishery Management Council [Docket No.: 130409354-3999-02] (RIN: 0648-

BD21) received January 13, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

4514. A letter from the Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Caribbean, Gulf of Mexico, and South Atlantic; Snapper-Grouper Fishery Off the Southern Atlantic States; Amendment 27 [Docket No.: 130312236-3999-02] (RIN: 0648-BD05) received January 13, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

4515. A letter from the Deputy Chief Counsel, Regulations and Security Standards, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Aircraft Repair Station Security [Docket No.: TSA-2004-17131; Amendment No. 1554-X] (RIN: 1652-AA38) received January 13, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

#### PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. DENHAM (for himself, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. COOK, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. VALADAO, Mr. ROHRBACHER, Mr. CAMPBELL, Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. MCCARTHY of California, Mr. NUNES, Mr. ISSA, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mr. ROYCE, and Mr. McKEON):

H.R. 3893. A bill to provide for the suspension of Federal funding for the California High Speed Rail Project until sufficient non-Federal funds are available; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. MASSIE (for himself, Mr. BRIDENSTINE, and Mr. DESANTIS):

H.R. 3894. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to repeal the inclusion in gross income of Social Security benefits; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina (for himself, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. RADEL, Mr. MULVANEY, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. GINGREY of Georgia, Mrs. BLACK, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mr. GOWDY, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. POE of Texas, Mr. KINGSTON, Mr. BROUN of Georgia, Mr. GRAVES of Georgia, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. ROKITA, and Mr. STUTZMAN):

H.R. 3895. A bill to renew America's founding principles by freeing Americans to produce more energy in the United States from all sources and contribute to the strength of American national security through North American energy independence; to the Committee on Natural Resources, and in addition to the Committees on Energy and Commerce, Transportation and Infrastructure, Ways and Means, Agriculture, Armed Services, and Oversight and Government Reform, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ (for herself, Mr. PETRI, Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. MURPHY of Florida, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, and Ms. WILSON of Florida):

H.R. 3896. A bill to amend the Longshore and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act to provide a definition of recreational vessel for purposes of such Act; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. CARTWRIGHT (for himself, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. HIGGINS, Mr. HONDA, Mr. LEWIS, Ms. LEE of California, and Ms. SCHAKOWSKY):

H.R. 3897. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to strengthen the rules for approved structured settlement factoring transactions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GRAYSON:

H.R. 3898. A bill to prohibit students who have been convicted of a criminal hazing offense under State law from receiving assistance under title IV of the Higher Education Act of 1965; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. SENSENBRENNER (for himself, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. LEWIS, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. BACHUS, Mr. CHABOT, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. DUFFY, and Mr. HOYER):

H.R. 3899. A bill to amend the Voting Rights Act of 1965 to revise the criteria for determining which States and political subdivisions are subject to section 4 of the Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MCCAUL (for himself and Mr. SCHIFF):

H.R. 3900. A bill to amend the Intelligence Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010 to facilitate access by the Comptroller General of the United States to information in the possession of the intelligence community, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Intelligence (Permanent Select).

By Mr. ROYCE (for himself, Mr. HENSARLING, Mr. GARRETT, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, Mr. CAMPBELL, Mr. LUCAS, Mr. MCHENRY, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. ROSS, Mrs. BACHMANN, Mr. COTTON, Mr. PITTINGER, Mr. HULTGREN, Mr. DUFFY, Mr. GRIMM, Mr. MULVANEY, Mrs. WAGNER, Mr. HUIZenga of Michigan, Mr. HURT, and Mr. BACHUS):

H.R. 3901. A bill to prohibit contributions by Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac to the Housing Trust Fund and the Capital Market Fund while such enterprises are in conservatorship or receivership, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. SCHIFF (for himself and Mr. ROGERS of Michigan):

H.R. 3902. A bill to amend the National Child Protection Act of 1993 to establish a permanent background check system; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BURGESS (for himself, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Mr. BUCSHON, and Mr. OLSON):

H.R. 3903. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to establish fair and consistent eligibility requirements for graduate medical schools operating outside the United States and Canada; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. BARROW of Georgia:

H.R. 3904. A bill to reduce the period of the availability of allowances for former Speakers of the House of Representatives to one year, beginning on the date of the expiration of an individual's service as Speaker; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mrs. BEATTY:

H.R. 3905. A bill to improve the response to missing children and victims of child sex trafficking; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BRALEY of Iowa (for himself and Mr. LOEBACK):

H.R. 3906. A bill to require States to carry out Congressional redistricting in accordance with plans developed by nonpartisan

service agencies of the legislative branch of State governments, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COHEN:

H.R. 3907. A bill to increase public confidence in the justice system and address any unwarranted racial and ethnic disparities in the criminal process; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COHEN:

H.R. 3908. A bill to amend title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 to provide for improvements under the Edward Byrne Memorial Justice Assistance Grant Program to reduce racial and ethnic disparities in the criminal justice system; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COHEN:

H.R. 3909. A bill to amend title 39, United States Code, to provide that the payment of a bill, invoice, or statement of account due, if made by mail, shall be considered to have been made on the date as of which the envelope which is used to transmit such payment is postmarked; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. COHEN:

H.R. 3910. A bill to amend title 39, United States Code, to allow the United States Postal Service to provide nonpostal services, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois:

H.R. 3911. A bill to amend the Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities Act to include bullying and harassment prevention programs; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Ms. DELBENE (for herself, Mr.

KIND, and Ms. PINGREE of Maine):

H.R. 3912. A bill to provide reimbursement under the Medicaid program to individuals and entities that provide voluntary non-emergency medical transportation to Medicaid beneficiaries for expenses related to no-load travel; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. DUFFY:

H.R. 3913. A bill to amend the Bank Holding Company Act of 1956 to require agencies to make considerations relating to the promotion of efficiency, competition, and capital formation before issuing or modifying certain regulations; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. FOSTER (for himself, Mr.

VEASEY, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. QUIGLEY,

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. TONKO, Mr.

LOWENTHAL, and Mr. HOLT):

H.R. 3914. A bill to provide for improvements in the treatment of detainees, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GRAYSON:

H.R. 3915. A bill to direct the Secretary of Education to modify the FAFSA to include a space for the purpose of identifying whether a student is a foster youth, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. KILMER:

H.R. 3916. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to promote the expansion of spectrum-based services to exceptionally hard-to-serve populations in unserved and underserved geographic locations; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. KILMER:

H.R. 3917. A bill to designate and expand wilderness areas in Olympic National Forest in the State of Washington, and to designate certain rivers in Olympic National Forest and Olympic National Park as wild and scenic rivers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. KILMER (for himself, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. PETERS of California, Ms. ESTY, and Mr. BERA of California):

H.R. 3918. A bill to amend sections 25 and 27 of the Stevenson-Wylder Technology Innovation Act of 1980 to improve the Office of Innovation and Entrepreneurship and regional innovation programs; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

By Ms. NORTON:

H.R. 3919. A bill to redesignate Rock Creek Park in the District of Columbia as Rock Creek National Park in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. NUGENT (for himself, Mr. BENTIVOLIO, Mr. FARENTHOLD, and Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania):

H.R. 3920. A bill to amend the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 to limit the acquisition of certain business records under that Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Intelligence (Permanent Select), for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. POLIS (for himself, Mr. CASTRO of Texas, and Ms. DELBENE):

H.R. 3921. A bill to incentivize State support for postsecondary education and to promote increased access and affordability for higher education for students, including Dreamer students; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. YARMUTH (for himself, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. SARBANES, and Mr. COHEN):

H.J. Res. 107. A joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to contributions and expenditures with respect to Federal elections; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CANTOR:

H. Con. Res. 75. Concurrent resolution providing for a joint session of Congress to receive a message from the President; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. HOLT (for himself, Mr. NUNES, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. LEWIS, Mr. HONDA, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. VALADAO, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. SESSIONS, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. COSTA, Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. ROHR-ABACHER, Mr. PETERS of California, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. FOSTER, Mr. FORTENBERRY, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Ms. CHU, and Mr. SMITH of Texas):

H. Con. Res. 76. Concurrent resolution recognizing the significance of the anniversary of the American Association for the Advancement of Science (AAAS) Science and Technology Policy Fellowship program, and reaffirming the commitment to support the use of science in governmental decision-making through such program; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

By Mr. DUFFY:

H. Con. Res. 77. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress opposing the proposal by the United States Department of State to relocate the United States Embassy to the Holy See; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BECERRA:

H. Res. 460. A resolution electing a Member to a certain standing committee of the House of Representatives; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. LIPINSKI (for himself, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. REED, Mr.

NEAL, Mr. JONES, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. HOLT, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. HIGGINS, Mr. JOYCE, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. BENISHEK, Mr. TIBERI, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. GRIMM, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. BARLETTA, Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. LATTA, Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. RUPERSBERGER, Mr. YARMUTH, Mr. SABLON, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. PIERLUISI, Mr. DOYLE, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. MORAN, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, and Mr. PETRI):

H. Res. 461. A resolution supporting the contributions of Catholic schools; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Ms. WILSON of FLORIDA (for herself, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. HOLT, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. POLIS, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. ANDREWS, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Ms. BASS, Mr. CONYERS, Ms. NORTON, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, and Ms. CASTOR of Florida):

H. Res. 462. A resolution recognizing January as "National Mentoring Month" and encouraging more people in the United States to mentor young people in their communities; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

## CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mr. DENHAM:

H.R. 3893.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution, specifically Clause 1 (relating to providing for the common defense and general welfare of the United States), Clause 3 (related to regulation of Commerce among the several States), and Clause 18 (relating to the power to make all laws necessary and proper for carrying out the powers vested in Congress).

By Mr. MASSIE:

H.R. 3894.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Constitutional authority for the Senior Citizens' Tax Elimination Act is found in Article I, Section 8, which gives Congress the power to lay and collect taxes.

By Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina:

H.R. 3895.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Congress has the power to enact legislation pertaining to the rules and regulations for property owned by the United States pursuant to Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2 of the Constitution.

Authority for additional functions of this legislation having to do with tax credits are found within Article I, Section 7; and Article I, Section 8, Clause 1. Authority to stay misapplied regulations from the executive Branch stems from Article I, Section 8, Clause 3.

By Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ:

H.R. 3896.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority on which this bill rests is the power of Congress to provide for the general welfare of the United States, as enumerated in Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution, and to regulate commerce as enumerated in Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3.

By Mr. CARTWRIGHT:

H.R. 3897.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 (relating to the power of Congress to regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.)

By Mr. GRAYSON:

H.R. 3898.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution.

By Mr. SENSENBRENNER:

H.R. 3899.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Fifteenth Amendment, Section 2

Section 1: The right of citizens of the United States to vote shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any state on account of race, color, or previous condition of servitude.

Section 2: The Congress shall have power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation.

By Mr. McCAUL:

H.R. 3900.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Sec. 8.

By Mr. ROYCE:

H.R. 3901.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Under Article I, Section 8, Clauses 1 ("The Congress shall have Power to lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States"), 3 ("To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes"), and 18 ("To make all Laws which shall be necessary and power for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof").

By Mr. SCHIFF:

H.R. 3902.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Congress has the power to enact the Child Protection Improvements Act pursuant to Article I, Section 8, Clause 18, the Necessary and Proper Clause. The Necessary and Proper Clause supports the expansion of congressional authority beyond the explicit authorities that are directly discernible from the text. Additionally, the Preamble to the Constitution provides support of the authority to enact legislation to promote the General Welfare.

By Mr. BURGESS:

H.R. 3903.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The attached bill is constitutional under Article I, Section 8, Clause 3: "To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes" as well as Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1: "The Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and

Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States."

By Mr. BARROW of Georgia:

H.R. 3904.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mrs. BEATTY:

H.R. 3905.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution.

By Mr. BRALEY of Iowa:

H.R. 3906.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. COHEN:

H.R. 3907.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clauses 1 and 3 of Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. COHEN:

H.R. 3908.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clauses 1 and 3 of Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. COHEN:

H.R. 3909.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 under the United States Constitution

By Mr. COHEN:

H.R. 3910.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, section 8, clause 3 (relating to the power to interstate commerce).

By Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois:

H.R. 3911.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Civil Rights Enforcement: Fourteenth Amendment, Sections 1 and 5—Section 1: All persons born or naturalized in the United States, and subject to the jurisdiction thereof, are citizens of the United States and the State wherein they reside. No State shall make or enforce any law which shall abridge the privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States; nor shall any State deprive any person of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law; nor deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws. Section 5: The Congress shall have power to enforce, by appropriate legislation, the provisions of this article. Spending Authorization: Article I, Section 8, Clause 1—The Congress shall have Power to lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defense and general Welfare of the United States.

By Ms. DELBENE:

H.R. 3912.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. DUFFY:

H.R. 3913.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8: To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. FOSTER:

H.R. 3914.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, "The Congress shall have Power to lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts, and Excises, to pay Debts and provides for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States."

By Mr. GRAYSON:

H.R. 3915.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution.

By Mr. KILMER:

H.R. 3916.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3

By Mr. KILMER:

H.R. 3917.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I Section 8 Clause 1 (relating to providing for the general welfare of the United States)

Article I Section 8 Clause 18 (relating to the power to make all laws necessary and proper for carrying out the powers vested in Congress)

Article IV Section 3 Clause 2 (relating to the power of Congress to dispose of and make all needful rules and regulations respecting the territory or other property belonging to the United States)

By Mr. KILMER:

H.R. 3918.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18

By Ms. NORTON:

H.R. 3919.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

clause 2 of section 3 of article IV of the Constitution.

By Mr. NUGENT:

H.R. 3920.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Commerce Clause in Article I, Section 8, Clause 3, and prohibition of unreasonable searches in Amendment IV of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. POLIS:

H.R. 3921.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 (relating to the power of Congress to provide for the general welfare of the United States) and Clause 18 (relating to the power to make all laws necessary and proper for carrying out the powers vested in Congress)

By Mr. YARMUTH:

H.J. Res. 107.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article V of the Constitution.

#### ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 38: Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. PEARCE, and Mr. RICE of South Carolina.

H.R. 118: Ms. CHU.

H.R. 184: Mr. TONKO.

H.R. 352: Mr. STEWART.

H.R. 477: Mr. KING of Iowa.

H.R. 508: Ms. KUSTER.

H.R. 578: Mr. DESJARLAIS.

H.R. 720: Mrs. LOWEY.

H.R. 940: Mr. MCALLISTER.

H.R. 964: Mr. SWALWELL of California.

H.R. 973: Mr. LUETKEMEYER.

H.R. 1010: Ms. GABBARD and Mr. HORSFORD.



H.R. 1070: Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia and Mr. DEUTCH.  
 H.R. 1074: Mr. HONDA.  
 H.R. 1250: Mr. SWALWELL of California.  
 H.R. 1339: Mr. SCHRADER.  
 H.R. 1355: Mr. STEWART.  
 H.R. 1518: Mr. ROSKAM.  
 H.R. 1528: Ms. VELÁZQUEZ and Mr. PAULSEN.  
 H.R. 1666: Ms. MATSUI.  
 H.R. 1726: Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mrs. CAPPS, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, Mr. WALZ, and Mr. BISHOP of Georgia.  
 H.R. 1731: Mr. CROWLEY.  
 H.R. 1732: Mr. DEUTCH.  
 H.R. 1750: Mr. TERRY, Mr. MCALLISTER, and Mr. POMPEO.  
 H.R. 1761: Mr. CALVERT, Ms. LOFGREN, and Mrs. BACHMANN.  
 H.R. 1852: Mr. GARRETT.  
 H.R. 1918: Ms. BROWN of Florida and Mr. ENYART.  
 H.R. 1972: Mr. COFFMAN.  
 H.R. 1975: Ms. MENG and Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York.  
 H.R. 2103: Mr. PAYNE and Mr. ANDREWS.  
 H.R. 2247: Mrs. BACHMANN and Mr. SMITH of Missouri.  
 H.R. 2288: Mrs. LOWEY and Mrs. NEGRETE MCLEOD.  
 H.R. 2305: Mr. VAN HOLLEN.  
 H.R. 2409: Mr. STEWART.  
 H.R. 2502: Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. TAKANO, Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico, and Ms. CASTOR of Florida.  
 H.R. 2504: Mr. WALZ, Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico, Mrs. WALORSKI, and Mr. FORBES.  
 H.R. 2536: Ms. KELLY of Illinois.  
 H.R. 2602: Mr. KING of Iowa.  
 H.R. 2839: Mr. SCOTT of Virginia and Mr. DELANEY.  
 H.R. 2841: Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. PINGREE of Maine, and Mr. ENYART.  
 H.R. 2847: Mr. DEFazio.  
 H.R. 2854: Mr. WILLIAMS.  
 H.R. 2866: Mr. LAMBORN.  
 H.R. 2939: Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois, Mr. MEEKS, and Ms. JACKSON LEE.

H.R. 2959: Mr. BURGESS, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. WENSTRUP, Mr. OWENS, Mr. HARPER, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, Mr. DESJARLAIS, Mr. FLEISCHMANN, and Mr. SMITH of Missouri.  
 H.R. 2998: Ms. FRANKEL of Florida.  
 H.R. 3040: Mr. ELLISON and Mr. LARSON of Connecticut.  
 H.R. 3081: Mrs. WAGNER.  
 H.R. 3121: Mrs. ROBY and Mr. BENISHEK.  
 H.R. 3133: Mr. WENSTRUP and Mr. REICHERT.  
 H.R. 3179: Mr. MARCHANT.  
 H.R. 3279: Mr. LUETKEMEYER.  
 H.R. 3335: Mr. SOUTHERLAND.  
 H.R. 3367: Mr. WOMACK.  
 H.R. 3370: Mr. ENGEL.  
 H.R. 3374: Mr. FOSTER.  
 H.R. 3408: Mr. BUTTERFIELD.  
 H.R. 3413: Mr. MCALLISTER.  
 H.R. 3461: Mr. CICILLINE and Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York.  
 H.R. 3467: Mr. NADLER.  
 H.R. 3471: Mr. RUIZ, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, and Mrs. LOWEY.  
 H.R. 3482: Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. BISHOP of New York, and Mr. COHEN.  
 H.R. 3486: Mr. PITTS.  
 H.R. 3488: Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Mr. KILMER, Mr. CAPUANO, Ms. SINEMA, and Mr. TIBERI.  
 H.R. 3489: Mr. JOYCE.  
 H.R. 3493: Mr. WALZ.  
 H.R. 3516: Ms. BROWNLEY of California.  
 H.R. 3518: Mrs. NEGRETE MCLEOD.  
 H.R. 3529: Mr. COTTON.  
 H.R. 3539: Mr. LUETKEMEYER.  
 H.R. 3541: Mr. WOMACK.  
 H.R. 3590: Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, Mr. DESJARLAIS, and Mr. KING of Iowa.  
 H.R. 3601: Mr. LUETKEMEYER.  
 H.R. 3658: Mr. KING of New York, Mr. LATTA, Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. LATHAM, Mr. WOMACK, Ms. TITUS, and Mr. BROUN of Georgia.  
 H.R. 3676: Mr. WOMACK.  
 H.R. 3693: Mr. OLSON and Mr. MASSIE.  
 H.R. 3717: Mr. CALVERT and Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana.

H.R. 3721: Mr. BRALEY of Iowa.  
 H.R. 3732: Mr. MESSER, Mr. MCKINLEY, Mr. RIBBLE, and Mr. MCHENRY.  
 H.R. 3747: Mr. BISHOP of New York.  
 H.R. 3771: Mr. SCHIFF, Ms. LOFGREN, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Ms. HAHN, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Ms. GABBARD, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, and Ms. TITUS.  
 H.R. 3776: Mr. YOUNG of Indiana.  
 H.R. 3784: Mr. MULVANEY.  
 H.R. 3788: Mr. GINGREY of Georgia and Mr. SOUTHERLAND.  
 H.R. 3824: Mr. BARBER, Mr. CUELLAR, Ms. LOFGREN, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Ms. ESTY, Mr. CARNEY, Mr. CASTRO of Texas, and Mr. GARAMENDI.  
 H.R. 3829: Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. PEARCE, and Mrs. LUMMIS.  
 H.R. 3852: Mr. GRIJALVA and Mr. RUSH.  
 H.R. 3855: Mr. CONYERS, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. BURGESS, Mr. POE of Texas, Mr. BLUMENAUER, and Mr. MCGOVERN.  
 H.R. 3865: Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. BOUSTANY, Mr. GRAVES of Missouri, Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas, Ms. JENKINS, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. REED, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mrs. BLACK, Mr. PAULSEN, Mr. TIBERI, Mr. HARPER, Mr. YOUNG of Indiana, Mr. RENACCI, Mr. ROSKAM, Mr. SMITH of Nebraska, Mr. NUNES, Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin, Mr. REICHERT, and Mr. SCHOCK.  
 H.R. 3872: Mr. SIRES.  
 H.R. 3878: Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr. SERRANO, and Mr. CARSON of Indiana.  
 H.R. 3879: Mr. HORSFORD.  
 H.R. 3880: Mr. WELCH.  
 H.R. 3881: Mr. WELCH.  
 H.R. 3882: Mr. WELCH.  
 H.R. 3885: Mr. MCKINLEY and Mr. FITZPATRICK.  
 H. Con. Res. 47: Ms. DELBENE.  
 H. Res. 75: Mrs. BEATTY.  
 H. Res. 356: Mr. KLINE.